

THE STANDARD

NO. 166---VOL. VII, NO. 10.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1890.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Published Every Wednesday at
No. 12 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

Entered at the post office in New York as second class
matter.

TERMS:

ONE YEAR \$2 50
SIX MONTHS 1 25

Advertising thirty cents per agate line.
All letters and communications should be addressed and all checks and drafts be made payable to "The Standard."

When ordering change of address send old as well as new address.

The correct filling of orders is evidence of receipt of remittance.

"The Standard" is an exponent of the principles and a weekly record of important facts affecting social problems and national politics. It especially advocates the following great reforms:

THE SINGLE TAX. This means the abolition of all taxes on labor or the products of labor, that is to say, the abolition of all taxes save one tax levied on the value of land irrespective of improvements.

FREE TRADE. Not "tariff reform," but real free trade; that is, as perfect freedom of trade with all the world as now exists between the states of our union.

BALLOT REFORM. No humbug envelope system; but the real Australian system, the first requisite of which is the exclusive use at elections of official ballots furnished by the state and prepared and cast by the voter in compulsory secrecy.

Sample copies sent free on application.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL. News of Mr. George—True Conceptions of Property Rights—Federal Ownership of Railways—Mr. Cleveland's Claim to Admiration—Stale News in a Tariff Reform Paper—Buying a Street Railway Privilege—Professor Swing and the Single Tax—A National Conference—Liberal Gains in Germany—An Unchristian Church Paper—Professor Huxley's Attack—The Death of John Jacob Astor—Some Farmers Learning, Others Buying Guns—How Long?

HUXLEY'S TIGER. George Crosoer.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON AND THE ABOLITION MOVEMENT. Sarah Mifflin Gay.

IT SHOULD BE A FREE TRADE CONFERENCE. Warren Worth Bailey.

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER. Henry George, Jr. Notes and Queries.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR. The Patent Out-sides—Imperialism Threatened—Mr. Teller Sees Some Things.

POWDERY TO SLOAN.

SOCIETY NOTES.

PERSONAL.

PROFESSOR HUXLEY ON HENRY GEORGE.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM. Land Purchase in Ireland—Federal Ownership of Railways—Reflections on Civil Service Reform—Mallock on Labouchere.

HOW TO REACH THE FARMER. R. G. Brown. **THE FREE TRADE FIGHT.** Frankly Selfish—Higher Rates on Wool—Brave Words in Iowa—Mr. Shearman at Ithaca.

BALLOT REFORM. Introducing the Petition—A Bit of Analysis—Proposed Amendments to the Saxon Bill—A Bill in New Jersey—Maryland Reformers Displeased—Brooklyn Democrats Favorable—North Dakota Will Have the Reform—Systematic Work in Oregon.

SINGLE TAX NEWS. Single Tax Platform—Letting in Light—From the Upper Lehigh—Cases in Point—New York City Assessments—The Petition—Pleasurable Evenings—The Flatbush Meeting—Policy of the Single Tax Men of Massachusetts—A County Conference to be Held in Chicago—A Club of Colored Men Organized in Baltimore—Kentucky Councilmen Petition for a Change in Taxation—An Ovation to Father Huntington in St. Louis—A Letter to be Sent to Kansas City Clergymen—The Memphis Trades Council Close to the Single Tax—A Suggestion from Florida—A Democratic Organization in Colorado Adopts a Single Tax Plan—Good News from Other States.

EDITORIAL.

We are glad to be able to announce that Mr. and Mrs. George arrived at the Hawaiian islands in good health. In a personal letter, dated Honolulu, February 15, Mr. George says: "We had not expected that letters mailed at Honolulu would get to San Francisco any sooner than letters mailed at Samoa, and consequently I had not written anything during the passage from San Francisco, having put in my time since leaving the Golden Gate in getting a good rest. But the heavy southwestern breezes that have filled our sails have kept here the steamer Australia, beyond her time, and on our arrival we find that she will not sail for half an hour yet, so that there is a chance to get a few lines by her mail.

"The whole trip so far has been very interesting and pleasant, but so many were the friends we met, and so warm their greetings, that it was utterly impossible to write from San Francisco. From Bradford to San Francisco every single tax man we have met has been hopeful and confident to the last degree. Even on the steamer the interest in the single tax is noticeable, and last evening, at the request of the passengers, I made an address in the social hall explaining what we propose and what we expect to accomplish by it.

"The passage down has been a pleasant one, and though about half of our passengers will be left behind in these islands, a very agreeable company will remain, and I look forward to the trip through the tropics with most pleasurable anticipation. We will have from half past 9 o'clock in the morning till 8 in the evening to see something of Honolulu and its surroundings. Between here and Samoa I will endeavor to make some notes of our trip that will interest the readers of THE STANDARD."

In his speech at the recent dinner of the Southern society, in this city, Charles H. Jones of the St. Louis Republic intimated that the real root of the so-called race problem in the south is the apparent incapacity of the negro to comprehend the right to property and his utter disregard of that right in practice. "Precisely the same problem," said Mr. Jones, "exists here in New York, and the solid citizens submit to having this great metropolitan city governed from Albany because they thus avert the consequences that would result from the unrestricted local dominance of an ignorant and irresponsible majority." This is equivalent to saying that the rich minority will not consent to live under government by the people in the city of New York, for fear that their taxes may be too high. By way of illustrating his point, Mr. Jones went on to say:

What did we witness here less than three years ago? Henry George is a man of character as well as ability. He is to be ranked unquestionably with the conservative forces of society. He could not be used as a tool by ignorant, reckless, or designing men. And yet the bare possibility of his election as mayor of this city caused alarm almost amounting to panic. The question here, as it was supposed to be, was precisely what it is in the south—the question of the protection and maintenance of property and of the institutions and society based on property.

Mr. Jones in this utterance offered evidence of the existence of a more serious evil than the ignorance naturally existing among a people removed but one generation from slavery. Why did the possi-

bility of the election to the mayoralty of one whom Mr. Jones ranks "with the conservative forces of society" cause the wild panic of which the politicians shrewdly took advantage through Abraham S. Hewitt's "society saving" cry? The answer is that the well-to-do and nominally educated classes are as absolutely devoid of any conception of an ethical basis for the rights of property as a negro laborer in a South Carolina rice swamp. They have never thought about it, and much less have they sought by careful investigation and logical reasoning to trace titles back to a just origin. Living under a government that recognizes the will of the people as the supreme power, and which freely changes laws from time to time, the mass of well-to-do people have assumed, without investigation, the wisdom and rectitude of all laws relating to property, and have hastened to abandon democratic government itself, as in the instance cited, on the mere suspicion that their property rights might be invaded by undue taxation. The common conception of property rights is based on no coherent system, fortified by no sound reason, and is nothing more than the projection into mature life of the instinct that causes the infant to hold on to whatever it can grab and to kick and scream when deprived of its find.

The defenders of a right of property having no better origin than this are easily capable of defending claims so manifestly unjust that they would be preposterous, if not sanctioned by long usage, and shielded from critical examination by the cowardice which causes every one not sure of the validity of his own claims to oppose all examination into the origin of titles.

A remarkable illustration of this has recently been brought to public attention in this city. Many years ago General John Hopper, a soldier of the revolution, settled on a farm in this island, through which ran, having the usual right of way only, the old Bloomingdale road. There appears to be no question that the general obtained, during his life-time, such reward as was then to be had from the application of his labor to the land he was permitted by society to hold for his own use, in consideration, doubtless, of paying what was then regarded as a fair tax on it. In course of time he died, and the possession of the land passed to others. Twenty years ago the present line of Broadway was substituted for the old Bloomingdale road, and here and there a portion of the latter was abandoned, and passed into private ownership, either by deed from the city or by the simpler process of moving out the front fences to correspond with the new street line. One strip of such land runs along the westerly side of Broadway from Forty-seventh street northward, with breaks here and there, and constitutes the frontage of nearly six lots now covered by buildings. The heirs of General Hopper do not appear to have taken any interest in the matter of changing the route of the highway through his old farm. They had sold their interest to others many years ago, and they took no part in transforming the property from a farm into a thickly built up portion of a great city. They in no way contributed to the erection of the buildings on the land now in dispute. Some supposedly sharp lawyer,

however, discovered this latent "right of property," and, it seems from the newspaper reports, formed a syndicate, way out in Omaha and Council Bluffs, to buy these "rights." This lawyer is now about to institute suit to recover possession of the land from the people whose trespass consists in putting it to the best and most profitable use, and if he succeeds he will be able to extract from the present occupants a fortune, since lots on Broadway in that neighborhood are easily worth \$30,000 each. The "sacred right of property" embodied in the law that sanctions this proceeding is questioned and denied by Henry George, and this denial probably caused the defendants in the present suit to join with those who sought to "save society" from the catastrophe threatened by Mr. George's possible election to the mayoralty, at the time referred to by Mr. Jones. What their present opinions are we do not know, but there are plentiful indications that they do not intend submitting without a lively fight to this particular effort to assert the sacred right of private property in land.

We do not blame them. Their instincts are safer guides than what they call their convictions. They are the rightful possessors of the ground on which their houses stand, and the law that would award these buildings and the land on which they stand to the representatives of the heirs of General Hopper are antagonistic to morality and right reason, and ought to be repealed. The community occupying this island a century ago had a perfect right to assign to General Hopper the exclusive possession of the farm in question, taking in return the annual value of the privilege thus conferred on an individual. So long as General Hopper continued to perform his part of the contract—that is, pay his taxes—he was justly entitled to retain possession, and all that he produced from or put upon the land thus held was rightfully his, to use, to sell or to bequeath. He had a title to such products that could be traced without difficulty, and the validity of which would be cheerfully conceded by every sane mind. He had paid the community the price it demanded for the privilege it had conferred upon him, and all that remained was his, for the simple reason that it was the product of his own capital and labor. If this individual right, as well as the public right, had been recognized, and the community had continued to take for its own use the increased annual value of the land, caused by the growth of population, no such complication as that now existing could possibly have arisen. General Hopper's descendants would have paid the annual tax and kept the property, or else they would have sold the buildings and the right of possession to some one else, who felt that he could put it to more profitable use. The changing of the course of the highway would have caused no trouble, since those thus acquiring additional land would have paid annually the value of the privilege, and no one would have had any temptation to raise the question of title at this late day, because the annual value of the privilege of occupation—that is, the ground rent—would continue to go to the public and not to the successful assertor of such a claim. The tenure of the rightful occupant would, under this system, instead of being less secure, be actually

more secure than it is under the existing system. In fact, the only individual right to property involved—that of the present possessors to buildings erected at their own cost—could never be so much as questioned under a system that, by clearly defining the rights of the community, thereby confessed and defined the rights that belong to the individual, even as against the community.

It is this failure to recognize the property rights of the community that has been the prolific cause of the confusion of thought concerning the property rights of individuals. It gives rise on the one hand to monopoly and plutocracy and on the other hand to socialism and communism. This ignorance of the true right to property is the root of the evils that affect society and government. Yet this lack of clear perception in a matter of vital importance has come about through processes easily traced by any student of English history. The gradual curtailment of the rights of the crown over land was brought about by the aristocracy—that is, the landlords. During the centuries of the control of English legislation by the representatives of the landed interests, the landlords, without disguise, legislated in their own interests. They confirmed their own possession of the soil, and gradually relieved themselves of obligations to the crown, which their predecessors had assumed as the necessary condition of possession. Unless this process is reversed the English democracy will discover, when it gains the sovereign power, that sovereignty has been denuded of its most important rights. For centuries the legislation of parliaments dominated by the landed interests successfully sought to curtail the royal power in the interest of the class controlling such legislation. It was simply a game of grab, based on no coherent theory and influenced by no ethical considerations whatever. So entirely was this the case that, in the "rough and tumble of their ways," these practical grabbers of privileges once held in consideration of duties performed, never even took the trouble to eliminate from the statute law the declaration that all lands belong to the crown. In this country—the problem not then seeming a practical one—we simply substituted "the people" for "the crown" and went on making statutes that permitted mere temporary custodians of power to assume to alienate irrecoverably a right that we theoretically acknowledge to be inherent in the people. This is amusingly illustrated in the constitution of New York, which after starting out, in article I section 11, with the positive assertion that "the people of this state, in their right of sovereignty, are deemed to possess the original and ultimate property in and to all lands within the jurisdiction of the state," goes on in section 13 of the same article to declare that "all lands within this state are declared to be allodial, so that, subject only to the liability to escheat, the entire and absolute property is vested in the owners, according to the nature of their respective estates." Could confusion of thought and statement go further!

But the attempts at the unwise abrogation of public rights did not end here. The sovereign power of the people—which obviously belongs to all and should never be used for the pecuniary and personal advantage of less than all—has been unhesitatingly used for the profit of the few. Franchises have been freely given that involved the transfer of a part of the sovereign power to individuals or private corporations, to be used for their own profit, without securing to the public any return for this use of its powers. Whether or not private individuals should,

under any circumstances, be thus invested with public powers, and given the absolute control of such essentially governmental works as public highways, is a debatable question—but there is no room for doubt as to the impropriety of using the public powers to endow individuals with special and profitable privileges without making ample provision for compensation to the public for this use of its powers. The same reasoning that demonstrates the necessity of a tax or rent to be paid to the community, that shall be the equivalent of the value of the privilege of private occupancy granted by the community, demands that public franchises, if granted at all, shall be similarly taxed. Not only has this manifest right of the public been neglected, but the supreme court, in the monstrous Dartmouth college decision, actually attempted to make these one-sided bargains, made by the temporary custodians of legislative power, binding not only on succeeding legislatures, but on successive generations, for all time. Happily, no court has yet dared deny to the sovereign people their taxing power, and this instrument, so long misused, may yet be made the engine by which the property rights of the whole people shall be restored, while the property rights of individuals are likewise made more definite and safe.

It was the mere declaration of this proper and peaceable purpose that caused the foolish panic that was the object of Mr. Jones's veiled sarcasm at the dinner of the Southern society. The people who are prone to pose as the "saviors of society" are subject to these panics, and in their fright and greed are apt to throw all considerations of civil liberty to the winds. The shadow of "the man on horseback" has already fallen across the history of this republic, and the people whose only conception of property rights is a blind acceptance of the "good old rule,"

That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.
naturally look to force to solve all questions affecting the rights to property. Ignorant as rice swamp negroes of any ethical basis for such rights, incapable of reasoning on the subject, such people easily become panic-stricken, and it ever has been so. When the effects of land grabbing were first made distressingly manifest in England, they called forth from Sir Thomas More a more coherent ideal of Utopia than like conditions have prompted Mr. Bellamy to offer to this generation, but they aroused also the bitter wrath and the wild fear of those who profited by the wrong. The "society saver" is not new in history. Speaking of the social distress and the riots against inclosure that were made the occasion for the seizure of arbitrary power by Henry VII, the historian Greene says:

It was this social danger which lay at the root of the Tudor despotism. For the proprietary classes the repression of the poor was a question of life or death. Employer and proprietor were ready to surrender freedom into the hands of the one power which could preserve them from social anarchy. It was to the selfish panic of the landowners that England owed the statute of laborers and its terrible heritage of pauperism. It was to the selfish panic of both land owner and merchant that she owed the despotism of the monarchy.

Let us have no more such panics. That of 1886 was as selfish as that in the reign of Henry VII; but the simple device of establishing a Tudor despotism is not practicable in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The autoocratic German emperor finds that he must gravely consider the social problem, while happily that embodiment and incarnation of the worst dream of hell that terror ever painted on the mind of a medieval peasant, the czar of Russia, is hated and ab-

horred by decent men in every civilized land, and is held a prisoner in his own palace by a reasonable fear of assassination.

The time has gone by either for maintaining the claims of the few or asserting the rights of the many by brute force. There is no cause for panic. There is such a thing as a right to property. It rests on reason and is fortified by ethical considerations appreciable by the common sense of the common people. It is as sacred as the right to life, liberty or the pursuit of happiness. Without its recognition and enforcement neither liberty nor the pursuit of happiness is possible. But in order that this right may be asserted and maintained it must first be understood. In order that private rights to property may be defined, the public right to that property, which from its nature belongs to all, instead of to the individual, must be asserted and enforced. It is a logical and a mathematical necessity that a line which actually includes the whole of one thing must necessarily exclude every other thing. So long as the boundary is indefinite or unknown, it is as impossible to say what is included as it is to say what is excluded. It is time that men capable of thought and possessed of knowledge gave their attention to the necessity of drawing this line between, not merely *meum* and *tuum*, but between the community and the individual. We are not asking now that the single tax theory shall be accepted, but merely that it and all other theories making any claim to be supported by rational argument shall be considered. Calling names and making faces will accomplish nothing. The men who would do anything toward the settlement of the great problems now forcing themselves on public attention must bring candid minds to a new and searching re-examination of many accepted precedents and customs.

So far as the single tax men are concerned, they have no fear as to the result of such an examination. If they can be shown to be wrong they are content to seek the great end they have in view by some better means. They cannot, however, be silenced by mere denunciation of the cruelty of the "confiscation" involved in the application of these principles. They are seeking to restore to the people that which the constitution of this state says belongs to them; and that is "the original and ultimate property in and to all lands" within the jurisdiction of the state. They do not propose to dispossess any holder, nor suddenly to destroy any privileges corruptly or improvidently conferred. They do, however, propose by the gradual removal of all other taxes to leave the single, or, as some one has called it, the "primal" tax, on land values the only tax in force, and through that means to recover for the people of this state a property right which is theirs, and of which they have been improperly deprived. Men may, if they will, attack the practicability or the utility of such a plan, but the upholders of the existing system are in no position to denounce it on the ground of immorality.

What infringement of rights, what violation of ethics, can be attributed to the theory of the single tax that will compare with the gross violations of right possible under the existing system? Take this Hopper case as an instance. Put to the men whose property rights are threatened by this suit the question as to the relative justice of the existing higgledy-piggledy, brush heap of barbaric precedents that may finally sanction the inherently preposterous claim of this Omaha lawyer, on one hand, and the single tax recognition of their right of possession so long as they pay a fair

ground rent in lieu of all taxes, on the other hand, and there is no question as to what their choice would be, if they were compelled to make a choice. As to the relative "cruelty" involved in the two results there is not even room for a question. Suppose the "poor widow" we are constantly hearing of owns one of these houses, what is to become of her? She would lose both house and land.

The truth is, using the word in its common and opprobrious sense, the single tax theory is the only one that absolutely abolishes confiscation. Recognizing the people as a whole as the rightful owner of the soil, we insist that the people as a whole have a right to the annual rental of their own property. This is the legitimate and rightful income of the public, and an income thus derived from the individual payments for the use of the property or powers belonging to all in common, is the only income that the public can rightfully have. Having secured to the community that which rightly belongs to it, we insist, to use a phrase from the Quaker discipline, that it shall be content to "live within the bounds of its circumstances," and keep its hands out of the pockets of individuals.

On the other hand, the individual having paid to the community the fair price for whatever superior advantage he has obtained from it, rightfully owns everything, over and above that payment, that is the product of his labor, his ingenuity or his skill. It is not only his as against any other individual, but his as against all other individuals combined; his, as the sea is the Lord's, "because He made it." Here is a right of property cognizable to the most ordinary perception; based on obvious ethics, whether the moral law is divine, natural or the result of human experience. Against a right of property thus established, thus comprehended; socialism and communism would clamor in vain, and the word confiscation would drop out of our vocabulary, unless it was revived as an epithet to hurl at any one who proposed that the power of the state should be used to invade this established and well defined individual right to property by taking from individuals that which they had earned to piece out the state's own revenue, because of the criminal extravagance of those charged with the administration of public affairs. In other words, unless an attempt were made to restore the present system of taxation the word confiscation would become obsolete. Let not the defenders of that system presume to again hurl the only word that describes its processes at the advocates of the single tax. They, not we, are the confiscators.

We have received several communications from clubs expressing opinions concerning the propriety of holding a national conference. We have turned them over to the enrolment committee in order that we may print at a later time extracts from all such communications, giving an idea of the current opinion on the subject among single tax men.

Mr. T. B. Blackstone, president of the Chicago and Alton railroad, in his recent annual report complains bitterly that the steps taken by the national and state governments to regulate railway charges, together with the encouragement given to the building of parallel roads, will eventually make worthless the stock of the great majority of railway companies in America, and make it unprofitable to operate such roads. He therefore suggests as a remedy that the federal government shall, either by negotiation or by the use of its power of eminent domain, acquire the ownership of all railroads engaged in interstate commerce

and manage the same, taking due precautions against making the management partisan and political. Such a proposition coming from a railway president is somewhat startling, and it at least gives gratifying evidence that we are approaching a time when some practicable step will be taken to put an end to taxing the public with a view to the payment of dividends on watered stocks.

At the dinner of the Southern society last week Mr. Charles H. Jones of St. Louis declared that Mr. Cleveland is demanded, not as a favorite son of any state, "but as a citizen of the republic, respected by all, trusted by all. When he came upon the stage of public affairs the country had been for sixteen years in a trance of political catalepsy, broken at four-year intervals by sham battles over sham issues. With courageous heart and unfaltering vision, he gave vitality to the real issue that will not down until it is settled, and settled right." Mr. Jones here describes briefly and pointedly the claim that Mr. Cleveland has on the admiration and respect of the American people. It was a combination of courage and conviction that led him to risk his own re-election by the introduction of the great principle into politics despite the protests of cowards and trimmers, that has made him the central figure in our politics, and that will keep him there until the issue he forces on public attention is settled; and, as Mr. Jones well says, "settled right."

The privilege of building a crosstown street railway from the foot of Grand street, on East river, to the foot of Fourteenth street, on North river, was recently put up at auction, and there was but one bidder, A. B. Stone, president of the Metropolitan crosstown railroad company. He offered three per cent of the gross receipts of the road, in addition to the three per cent fixed by law, for the first five years, and five per cent over the legal requirement thereafter, making six per cent of gross receipts for the first five years and eight per cent thereafter. This is vastly better than giving away the privilege, as was the former custom, but it certainly seems surprising that there should be but one bidder for so valuable a franchise. Are these matters fixed up so that bidders shall not interfere one with another?

Mr. Warren Worth Bailey is right in declaring that the proposed conference, if held, should be a free trade conference. However, no single tax conference could fail to be a free trade conference, whatever else it might be. So far as there is any demand for a conference it is for one representing the single tax organizations throughout the country. But one of the most prominent features of such a gathering should be a great single tax mass meeting, and it would be eminently proper to have this followed on the next evening by a great free trade meeting, provided such men as those mentioned by Mr. Bailey can be induced to attend a real free trade meeting. So far as tariff reform is concerned the single tax men will work for it as a step in the right direction, but when it comes to getting up meetings the men who care to limit their aspirations to imposing a five per cent check on thieving may manage all meetings that demand nothing further than tariff reform.

In a recent issue of the New York Times appears an editorial embodying a part of the reply made by Mr. A. B. Farquhar, the agricultural implement manufacturer of York, Pa., commenting on an utterance of his in 1885, which the Times construed into the advocacy of subsidies. Mr. Farquhar has for a long time been a conspicuous advocate of free

trade. The Times, in commenting on his letter, welcomes him to the ranks of those who see that something more than subsidies is required to increase our trade, and says "the adhesion of one who formerly joined in the cry for subsidies is more precious to the tariff reform cause than that of the ninety and nine who were always for it." Especially if the ninety and nine are so little informed concerning the movement as to be unaware of the attitude of a man like Mr. Farquhar on the question. Such ignorance on the part of a tariff reform newspaper is simply inexcusable.

Professor David Swing of Chicago, in an attempt to comment on some pamphlets recently issued by Mr. Edward Osgood Brown of that city, says, "In the Henry George theory the land tax must be low, because the poor man is to pay it." This shows that Professor Swing has not the slightest understanding of Mr. George's theory. Poor men pay the land tax now, and it is by no means low. The unfortunate thing is that they pay it to private parties and then the government takes away a large portion of their earnings in the shape of other taxes, direct and indirect. Professor Swing had better read Mr. George's books before attempting to comment on them.

LIBERAL GAINS IN GERMANY.

The failure of the daily papers to give to their readers any intelligible account of the issues on which the recent election in Germany turned renders it difficult to judge of dispatches, such as occasionally appear, professing to throw some light on the subject. A dispatch printed in the Mail and Express, but which does not appear in any of the Associated press papers, declares that the platform on which the socialists went before the people, and on which they gained their tremendous increase of votes, includes the following proposals:

Universal military service in the form of a militia instead of a permanent army; absolute freedom of the press and liberty to meet in public for public purposes; free education; a normal working day; the prohibition of Sunday work and child labor; the unrestricted right of workmen to administer as they please the funds raised for the relief of comrades, and, finally, the substitution of a single tax for all the taxes now in existence.

These proposals fall far short of the ordinary socialistic programme, and are actually less radical in their demands for the increase of governmental powers than the programme of the young emperor.

It is impossible from the data at hand to form any judgment of what is meant by the term single tax, as used in the programme quoted; but it seems almost impossible that any suggestion of a single tax, taking the place of all others, can be made that contemplates as a basis of taxation anything other than land values. There does not appear in the reported platform any allusions to the "nationalization of machinery," and it seems improbable that the disciples of Marx have contented themselves with omitting their pet demand from their platform.

We shall not have to await much beyond the meeting of the new reichstag to find out what it means, for socialists have already elected more than twenty-five members, and any party possessing that number has, under German parliamentary custom, the power to originate and introduce bills. If the socialistic demands are as described, it seems more than probable that they will receive the support of the freisinnige party, which has made notable gains in the secondary elections, and has secured seats for its leaders, Virchow, Stauffenberg and Haenel. The results thus far indicate that the freisinnige party and the socialists have made the most remarkable gains, and that the conservatives have nearly held their own, while the national

liberal party, so called, has almost gone to pieces. These elections have practically divided the German people into three parties, the conservatives, the true liberals and the socialists, with a few scattered groups outside, unaffiliated with any of the principal parties.

AN UNCHRISTIAN CHURCH PAPER.

After delivering a lecture recently before the single tax club of Rochester, Father Huntington was asked whether the temperance, or prohibition, principle was not more important—more necessary to the welfare of the people and the state than the single tax. After a pause, in which the audience sat expectant, Father Huntington declared that if all the drunken men in Rochester were to become sober and industrious that night, it would be worse for the city because if the men now useless, because of their vices, were to suddenly become useful, and enter into competition for work, they would so crowd the overcrowded labor market as to further reduce the rate of wages and make misery more general.

The St. Andrew's Record, a parish paper published in Rochester, takes Father Huntington severely to task for what it calls the error of regarding the wages of men as of the first importance, and it dogmatically declares that "it were better for Rochester, on any day or night, that all our men, our women and our children should starve to death than that any of our men or women should be intemperate or unchaste."

Surely the St. Andrew's Record spoke without stopping to think when it uttered a sentiment so atrocious. Neither Father Huntington nor THE STANDARD seeks to justify or excuse intemperance; but Father Huntington has found out by actual experience the hopelessness of trying to keep men and women sober and chaste under conditions that make their daily lives miserable—conditions that compel them to live amid scenes of degradation that inevitably drag them down to ruin. It is hunger and cold, brought about by false economic conditions—by the lack of the rule of justice on earth—that drives men to intemperance and women to vice, and there is no cure for the tendency but to change the conditions. The so-called Christian paper that shuts its eyes to causes while it dallies with palliatives and denounces mere effects, is an obstacle to the establishment of righteousness on earth.

Father Huntington spoke the exact truth. Under existing conditions, it would add to the misery of any community if all its worthless members were suddenly to become industrious, and begin competing with the present workers for employment. The man who cannot see that this is true is stupid. The man who does see it, and is not moved thereby to do something to change the conditions that make the statement true, ought not to set up any claim either to patriotism or religion.

PROFESSOR HUXLEY'S ATTACK.

In a recent number of the Nineteenth Century Professor Huxley attempted to make short work of Henry George's theories by denying that man has any natural right to life, to liberty, or to anything else. Mr. Huxley merely restated a wornout and utterly inconclusive metaphysical argument, and then proceeded to demonstrate either that he has never read "Progress and Poverty," or that he has not given it the close attention necessary to enable him to comprehend it. Mr. Huxley, great as he is as a scientist, brings to the discussion of economic topics an ignorance of recent economic discussion, such as might easily be displayed by an economist who would rush into the field of physics, proclaiming as great accepted truths such old saws as "nature abhors a vacuum." His arguments

and assertions are sufficiently answered by Mr. George Croseer's communication and by the leading article from the Liverpool Financial Reformer, both printed in this issue.

We see from Mr. Smalley's dispatch to the Sunday Tribune that Professor Huxley has, in the March Nineteenth Century, another article entitled "Capital, the Mother of Labor," in which, according to Mr. Smalley, he "once more pulverizes what is left of Henry George and his windy theories." Considering the fact that Mr. Huxley is not a lord, Mr. Smalley displays a great deal of admiration for him. If Mr. Huxley has really set out to revamp the exploded "wage fund" theory, and show that capital is the mother of labor, there is no cause for surprise in his recent public announcement that he is no longer able to attend public meetings, "owing partly to growing deafness and partly to a curious liability to become rapidly fatigued and voiceless by talking." Of course a man whose powers are thus waning cannot be expected to enter an entirely new field of study, shorn of old prejudices and capable of vigorously grappling with new truths.

THE DEATH OF JOHN JACOB ASTOR.

The New York Times, in an editorial article concerning the death of John Jacob Astor, said that Mr. Astor had not the time, and probably had not the inclination for activities outside of the work of caring for his vast estate, and that thus it happened that the richest man in America, and one of the richest in the world, was known by sight to only a comparatively small number of the people of the city in which he lived, and a large part of which he owned. Can such a man be a valuable citizen? We have no doubt that John Jacob Astor conscientiously performed the duties of life in accordance with his convictions. He appears to have been just in his dealings, generous toward the poor and steadfast in his devotion to the church, and hence all who knew him have reason to honor his memory.

So far as the community is concerned, however, there is no reason for interest in his life or death. He was simply a man who, under existing law, had inherited the right to levy for his personal use a tax on the industry and enterprise of a great metropolis as a reward for permitting men to live and work on this island, a great portion of which he owned. Toward the growth of the community in wealth and numbers he contributed but little, but he was authorized to take to himself an ever increasing percentage of the wealth created by others. It is true he built some houses, but this was merely incidental to the development of his interests as a landlord.

As a landlord he was of no conceivable use. No one questions his intelligence; yet had he been an imbecile in charge of a trustee or an absentee landlord spending dollars earned by New Yorkers in London or Paris, his income would have gone on increasing and it would have been paid out of the labor of others just as it was paid while he lived here in New York, and just as it will continue to be paid to his successor, now that John Jacob Astor is dead. In fact the New York Sun, in a eulogy on the dead multi-millionaire, says that his son and heir, William Waldorf Astor, now probably the richest man on earth, can hardly fail to hand down to future generations an estate vastly more valuable than that which he receives from his father. The Sun says that this would be the case even if Mr. Astor were a man ambitious of display and extravagant in his mode of living. He might, it says, gratify impulses to profuse expenditure and yet use up so small a part of his income that the

amount thus disposed of would be insignificant in comparison with the whole. It predicts that the estate will double in value in a comparatively few years, since it has been extended largely in Westchester county, and includes much other unimproved property that must soon be brought into use as sites for residences and business structures.

This is equivalent to saying that whereas John Jacob Astor anticipated the march of improvement so that he was able to levy an enormous tribute on the labor and capital that have made New York what it now is, he has bequeathed to William Waldorf Astor the power to levy similar tribute on the labor and capital that will be devoted to the development of the city; as its increased population causes it to press further northward beyond even its present legal limits. That the Sun should see this so clearly and at the same time gloat over it, is characteristic, but why the Times should go out of its way to defend the system and initiate a disparaging comparison of the careers of Jay Gould and the Vanderbilts with that of John Jacob Astor it is difficult to see. Jay Gould has doubtless done much harm and been unscrupulous in his dealings with other men, but he has at least appeared to promote the building of railroads, where without him they might not have been built, while the Vanderbilts have unquestionably rendered services to the community even though they have, through an unwise monopoly, for which the community itself is responsible, been permitted to obtain undue rewards for such services. Neither they nor Mr. Astor can be held guilty of any moral wrong in accepting what seemed to them natural rewards under the established system, but it is nonsense for a paper like the Times to pretend that the rewards for the active promotion of great enterprises are not better earned than those of the mere land holder, who renders no service whatever in return for the great privilege that he enjoys.

SOME FARMERS LEARNING—OTHERS BUYING GUNS.

We print in this issue of THE STANDARD an article by Mr. R. G. Brown, giving a description of the work of the publication committee of the Memphis single tax association. The committee consists of T. J. Crofford, Wm. Horgan, R. G. Brown and Bolton Smith. All communications concerning its work should be addressed to the latter at 59 Madison street, Memphis, Tenn. The article itself gives evidence of the importance and value of the work that this committee has undertaken. Similar work can doubtless be done by other associations, and it can be better done in this way than by any central organization, since a different kind of matter needs to be furnished for various localities. The Memphis association has taken the lead in this important matter, and it deserves and should receive the most liberal support.

Already evidence has come to the projectors of the work that they are reaching men who first heard of the single tax through these "patent outsiders," and Mr. Brokaw writes to the same effect from South Dakota. The farmers have been reached in this way, and many of them have had their old prejudices removed and are really studying the single tax, instead of denouncing it.

How much disposed they are, at first, to oppose our doctrines, instead of studying them, was amusingly illustrated the other day. A correspondent in Illinois sent a vigorous appeal to the editor of the weekly edition of one of our great dailies to put something in the next issue of his paper that would put an end to this Henry George business. He said that

there was wild excitement in his neighborhood. "The single tax men," he declared, "are flooding the country with literature and the farmers are buying guns!" After the work started by our Memphis friends has gone a little further the farmers will not want to shoot their best friends—the advocates of the single tax.

HOW LONG?

The Albany correspondent of the New York Times charges that Governor Hill is interfering to prevent the passage of Senator Chase's bill, providing for an annual personal registration of voters in all cities of this state of over 16,000 population. The governor's objection to the bill is based on the declaration that it does not go far enough, since it fails to require an annual personal registration throughout the state. There is no doubt that this is true, but the way to get registration extended throughout the state, is to extend it, as rapidly as public sentiment will permit, to the smaller cities. Governor Hill is perfectly aware of this fact, and his interference against the passage of a practical measure of reform gives evidence that he does not desire honesty in any of the processes of holding elections.

That Governor Hill should adopt such a course is not surprising, but it is surprising that he should appear to be able to carry with him, in his opposition to every step toward honest elections, the democratic members of the legislature from the rural districts. Despite Hill's grip on the democratic machine, and the victory he won by the trading presidency of the United States for the governorship, decent democrats have been able to convince the country at large that Hill does not really represent the democratic masses in this state. This will not continue if the rural members of the legislature follow Hill's lead against all efforts to obtain honest elections. From Tammany the country expects nothing good. The democracy of the country hates Tammany and regards it as worse than it really is, but if democratic legislators from all parts of New York state sustain Governor Hill in his vicious opposition to every real reform, the next democratic convention, while refusing to nominate Hill, may reasonably be expected to refuse to nominate any one to whom he is opposed.

How much longer are Grover Cleveland's friends going to continue their fatal policy of supineness? Do any of those close to the ex-president imagine that they can conciliate the greedy and conscienceless trickster and traitor who sold out his party's presidential ticket and who hates Cleveland as bitterly as Charles A. Dana hates righteousness? Many of Mr. Cleveland's most earnest admirers and most steadfast supporters are such solely because they regard him as a brave leader in the cause of reform. Governor Hill is not only the arch enemy of all true reform, but he is gradually putting the democratic party of New York into a similar attitude. Many reformers are beginning to ask where is our leader in this fight?

PROFESSOR HUXLEY'S TIGER.

A good deal of attention has been attracted by an article by Professor T. H. Huxley in the Nineteenth Century for February, the article in question being a vigorous attack upon the theories of Mr. Henry George, and by a writer of the highest scientific reputation.

Professor Huxley mentions a story which once made an impression on him; a story of an Indian villager who was carried off by a tigress, which delivered him over to her cubs, to be bitten and scratched in the most terrible manner. Whenever the unfortunate man succeeded in beating off his small tormentors, he re-

ceived a grip or a cuff from the mother, and was again rendered helpless, his torture then recommencing.

One might think that it was contemplated to point out some analogy between the beast of prey and the predatory human species—the landlord. But this does not turn out to be the case. Professor Huxley's object is to show that the arguments in support of the existence of natural human rights might also be used to prove that tigers possess natural rights, among them being the right to treat men in the manner described in the story.

The point and substance of the article, however, is a criticism of the doctrine of natural rights to the use of the earth, and of the practical measures advocated to secure the exercise of those rights. Professor Huxley says: "It is an extraordinary notion that the logical consequence of the 'natural right' of all men to any given thing is the sharing of the rights of property in that thing equally among all the claimants. Let us suppose two boys, John and Peter. I take an apple out of my pocket, and say, 'This apple is entirely yours, John; and Peter, it is also entirely yours. The whole apple belongs to each of you, and you have each a right to eat the whole of it. Now, my boys, you may eat it, so long as neither of you gives up any fraction of the right I have given him nor infringes the other's right.' The boys, I take it, would be somewhat puzzled. If their common sense, plus their appetites, were stronger than their logical faculty, they would probably suggest that they should divide the apple and each eat half. But I should have to say, 'No. You are violating my conditions, which were that you should neither of you give up any portion of his right to the whole. The arrangement you propose necessitates that John should give up his right to one half, and Peter his right to the other.' Not improbably my young friends, if of English extraction, might propose another way out of the difficulty, namely, the wager of battle. But again I should have to refuse. The trial by battle would involve the infringement of the natural rights of the victor. In fact, under the conditions stated, the apple would have to remain uneaten."

Of course it is intended to imply that there would be the same difficulty in securing equal rights to land. But I don't know that any man, or any body of men, ever seriously proposed to eat the earth, or in any way diminish it or to remove it to any distant spot in the universe, though some contrive to eat a good deal of its produce without taking any part in production. What is really wanted is that men shall have the use of it under the most favorable conditions possible. And I think it is quite possible that more than one individual can have the use of it at the same time, so that the single tax need not involve us in the dilemma in which Peter and John found themselves with the apple.

But Professor Huxley seems to object more particularly to Mr. George's distinctions between the title to land and the title to other property; and to his proposal that improvements which ultimately become indistinguishable from the land itself should after a long time be regarded as part of the land; that the greater should swallow up the less, and not the less swallow up the greater. Professor Huxley seems to fear that the distinction could not be maintained, and that the mode of treatment suggested might result in the smaller values swallowing up the larger. He takes the case of a chronometer as an illustration of a commodity in which the value of the raw material is small compared with that conferred by labor. He says: "I might say to the chronometer maker, 'The gold and the iron of this timepiece are parts of the material universe, therefore the property of mankind at large. It is very true that your skill and labor have made a wonderful piece of mechanism out of them, but these are only improvements. Now you are entitled to claim the improvements, but you have no right to the gold and the iron—they belong to mankind.' The watchmaker might reasonably think that the task set before him was as difficult as

that imposed upon Shylock when he was told that he was entitled to have his pound of flesh, but he must shed no blood in the cutting it out."

Under the single tax the watchmaker would have paid the community a trifling consideration of the elements abstracted from the soil—that is, if any one else wanted them—and he would have a pretty good title to any number of chronometers he might make, and not merely to the disembodied spirits of them, without any of the perplexity of the famous loan office proprietor. And one can hardly insult Professor Huxley by supposing that a man so accustomed to scientific analysis would find any difficulty in distinguishing between a chronometer and a section of unimproved land. One might rather suppose that he had some pecuniary interest in the present system, but the fact seems to be that he has not, as some Americans say, "seen the cat." If Professor Huxley were to employ his genius in forming an impartial opinion of the probable working of the single tax system, and apply his undoubted literary ability to giving a forcible and vivid description of it, he would achieve a higher reputation than he has even now; and had he the good fortune to have lived in an age when the system was a practical reality, he would probably have found better opportunities for scientific research and a community better able to appreciate science than the present one, especially as the progress of discovery would confer benefits upon all, and not merely upon a comparative few. GEORGE CROSER.

Loo Road, New Barnet, England, February 14, 1890.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON AND THE ABOLITION MOVEMENT (SECOND PAPER.)

In September, 1834, Mr. Garrison and his young bride began housekeeping in a charmingly secluded cottage in Roxbury. Thither in his midnight walk from the office he was often followed by his solicitous colored friends, who knew the risk he ran of "being waylaid by murderous enemies." The glimpses which we catch in these volumes of the gratitude and devotion of the free people of color to Mr. Garrison are most touching, and in pleasing contrast to the hatred and malice displayed so often by our white fellow citizens. A Boston paper suggested a "salutary coat of tar and feathers for Garrison and his associates." Pro-slavery and anti-negro riots broke out in many places; furiously in New York and Philadelphia. Some of this excitement was caused by the presence of George Thompson, who had considered favorably Mr. Garrison's suggestion "to come over and help" the American abolitionists. Leaving the country where he had won the honorable name of Liberator, and turning his back on the prospect of a brilliant career at the bar, he lifted his eloquent voice on American soil in behalf of the American slave, and received for his self-sacrifice the abuse of our press and the brickbats of our mobs.

Hitherto the anti-slavery agitation had been a purely moral one; now abolitionists began to catechise political candidates. Mr. Garrison said "he belonged to no party in particular . . . he was not deceived or influenced by names, but governed by principles." That the reverse was generally the case then, as it is now, is well illustrated by this extract from the diary of John Quincy Adams: "Slavery and democracy, especially the democracy founded as ours is, on the rights of man, would seem to be incompatible with each other. And yet at this time the democracy of the country is supported chiefly if not entirely by slavery." And this prophecy of Mr. Garrison's will sound familiar to readers of THE STANDARD: "The success of any great moral enterprise does not depend upon numbers. Slavery will be overthrown before a majority of all the people shall have called voluntarily, and on the score of principle, for its abolition." Meantime, "in the hurricane excitement of the times," wrote Mr. Garrison, "all pandemonium is let loose . . . rapine and murder have overcome liberty and law

perilous times have come." Now first, in 1835, the progress of the agitation compelled the northern wing of the American church to take sides for or against slavery. How bitter to Mr. Garrison, over whose orthodoxy no shade had yet come, to find the religious press "filled with apologies for sin and sinners of the worst class," to confess that "American (not Bible) Christianity is the main pillar of American slavery!" The activity of the American anti-slavery society especially alarmed the south. Mass meetings were held; the suppression of the abolitionists demanded; the Charleston post office was broken into by leading citizens and incendiary matter from New York burned in the presence of three thousand persons; effigies of Garrison and others were hanged and burned. "Will the north show its indignation against the deluded fanatics," asked the Richmond Whig, "by works as well as words?" Among the prompt replies of the north, the offer of five thousand dollars for the head of Arthur Tappan, *on the New York Exchange*, deserves to be mentioned. But the most weighty and important answer was given by the "social, political, religious and intellectual elite of Boston" in Faneuil Hall ("Call it no longer," cried Mr. Garrison, "THE CRADLE OF LIBERTY, but the REFUGE OF SLAVERY!"), at a meeting presided over by the mayor and addressed by the most eminent lawyers of the state. Resolutions were passed expressing sympathy and promising aid to the south and denouncing abolitionists and "foreign emissaries." After this meeting Boston was not a safe place for Mr. Garrison. He writes at this time of a friend. "They offer three thousand dollars for his ears—a purse has been made up publicly of \$20,000 in New Orleans for his person. I, too—I desire to bless God—am involved in almost equal peril . . . \$20,000 has been offered for my head by six Mississippians!"

The second volume of this biography⁽¹⁾ opens with a vivid picture of the Boston mob of October 21, 1835, in which Mr. Garrison nearly lost his life. The opportunity for "gentlemen of property and standing" to show their determination "to put a stop to the impudent bullying conduct of the foreign vagrant Thompson and his associates in mischief," was afforded by the anniversary meeting of the Boston female anti-slavery society. Several thousand persons collected near the building. "Within," said Mr. Garrison, "I found about fifteen or twenty ladies assembled, sitting with cheerful countenances and a crowd of noisy intruders gazing upon them." The president earnestly desired him to retire, for his own safety and the peace of the meeting; unable to leave the building, Mr. Garrison entered the anti-slavery office next the hall, where through the partition "the clear, untremulous tone of voice of that Christian heroine in prayer . . . was distinctly heard even in the midst of [the] hisses, threats and curses." The cry on the street was for "Thompson!" The mayor, arriving, assured the mob that Mr. Thompson was out of town, cleared the building and ordered the ladies to desist. "When we emerged into the open daylight there went up a shout of rage and contempt," wrote Maria Weston Chapman; but the crowd slowly gave way before them. The cry then changed for "Garrison!" The mayor and his friends urged him to escape by a carpenter's shop in the rear of the building. His retreat, however, was cut off by the mob, and he was dragged to a window; "but one of them relented and said: 'Don't let us kill him outright.' So they drew me back and coiled a rope about my body." Descending a ladder placed for the purpose, he was seized by two or three powerful men, who proved to be friendly, and was pressed by them through the surging crowd to the city hall. Here a terrible struggle ensued, but the mob lost their victim. The mayor and constables closed the door against

the rioters, and Mr. Garrison was carried up to the mayor's office. Here it was quickly decided that his presence endangered the building, and "the preservation of my life depended upon committing me to jail, ostensibly as a disturber of the peace!" The necessary papers made out, Mr. Garrison was re-clothed by the by-standers—for his garments had been nearly torn from him—and hurried down to a hack at the north door, the attention of the mob being diverted by another hack and a show of force at the south entrance. But only for a moment—the mob recognized Mr. Garrison and rushed "like a whirlwind upon the frail vehicle" in which he sat. The struggle continued to the very door of Leverett street jail which closed at last upon the single innocent and *against* a whole town full of the guilty. He was released the next morning after a trial for form's sake. As we read the account, we marvel at the serene courage of Mr. Garrison; no wonder it inspired the sonnet with which this chapter ends. The secular and religious press, with hardly an exception, laid the blame for this affair upon the abolitionists. Mr. Garrison was obliged to give up his house in Boston in deference to the fears of his landlord; and the Liberator, too, was turned out of doors. Mr. Thompson wisely decided that a live man in England could do more for the cause of the suffering and dumb than a dead man in America, and sailed privately for home. Harriet Martineau, by her words at the adjourned meeting of the female anti-slavery society, drew down the wrath of the "respectable" and ruffianly elements of society on her noble head, and the native abolitionists found themselves again and again the victims of the same "mysterious, metaphysical and almost electric frenzy" which had seized certain citizens of Missouri when they burned a colored man at the stake; which, in the opinion of Judge Lawless, was not an indictable offence, because it was "not the act of numerable and ascertainable malefactors, but of congregated thousands."

In reply to a sermon by Dr. Lyman Beecher on the "Growing Desecration of the Sabbath," Mr. Garrison had rebuked him for "being so strenuous in behalf of the Fourth commandment while giving his protecting influence to slavery, which annihilated the *whole decalogue*. . . . Let men consecrate to the service of Jehovah not merely one day in seven, but *all* their time." Hardly less offensive to the clergy than this anti-Sabbatical attitude was the appearance on anti-slavery platforms of the Grimke sisters, ladies of South Carolina who had fled from the contemplation of slavery to labor for its overthrow. Add to this the occasional mention of "Perfectionist" doctrines in the Liberator; Mr. Garrison's belief in the ultimate political dismemberment of the Union; his despair in view of the fact of a union of church and state in support of slavery, and the Liberator's attacks upon slaveholding parsons, and we have briefly the causes of clerical animosity to Mr. Garrison, which first showed itself in 1837, and a few years later split the abolition ranks in two. Hitherto they had been accused of being "men of one idea;" henceforward their enemies as unjustly blamed them for luging in "extraneous subjects."

But a terrible event was destined to raise up friends for the abolitionists. "No personal incident of the anti-slavery struggle, the fate of John Brown excepted, made so deep an impression in the north as the murder of Lovejoy." Lovejoy was editor of the Observer, an anti-slavery paper published at Alton, Ill. The mob had destroyed three presses, and the friends of law, order and free speech determined to protect the fourth. The mob attacked and set fire to the warehouse which held it. Of the little band of twenty which left the burning building to face the drunken and infuriated mob, Lovejoy alone was killed. The feeling aroused by this atrocity in Boston "revealed the oratory and fixed the destiny of Wendell Phillips, and with him drew Edmund Quincy into

the forefront of the ranks of the despised abolitionists." This period has been described as a reign of terror. Mr. Garrison, though greatly worn by the labor and strain it had brought him, was not spared its climax—the burning of Pennsylvania Hall. This beautiful building, erected by the friends of liberty in Philadelphia at a cost of \$40,000, was dedicated on Monday, May 14, 1838. Mr. Garrison describes the scene on Wednesday evening: "The floor of the hall was densely crowded with women. . . . The side aisles and spacious galleries were as thickly filled with men. When I rose to speak I was greeted with applause. . . . As soon, however, as I had concluded my address, a furious mob broke into the hall, yelling and shouting as if the very fiends of the pit had broken loose. The audience . . . would undoubtedly have been broken up had it not been for the admirable self-possession of some of the individuals, particularly the women. The mobocrats finding that they could not succeed in their purpose, retreated into the street, and surrounding the building, began to dash in the windows with stones and brickbats." A. E. Grinke Weld spoke. "As the tumult from without increased and brickbats fell thick and fast . . . her eloquence kindled, her eye flashed and her cheeks glowed as she devoutly thanked the Lord that the stupid repose of that city had at length been disturbed by the force of truth." The next evening it was impossible to hold a meeting. The keys were delivered to the mayor, who requested the rioters to retire and then went home himself. "They had now increased to several thousands, and soon got into the hall by dashing open the doors with their axes. They then set fire to this huge building, and in the course of an hour it was a solid mass of flames. The bells of the city were rung and several engines rallied, but no water was permitted to be thrown upon the building. The light of the fire must have been seen a great distance. At midnight, by the advice of friends, I left the city with a friend in a carriage. . . . Awful as is this occurrence in Philadelphia, it will do incalculable good to our cause; for the wrath of man worketh the righteousness of God. Our friends are all in excellent spirits shouting alleluia! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth! Let the earth rejoice!"

The Peace convention held in Boston in September had momentous consequences for the abolitionists. It was indebted to Mr. Garrison for its declaration of sentiments and for the name "Non-resistance," which covered the ground of individual as well as national action. It strengthened the sectarian opposition to Mr. Garrison in an unexpected manner. "A clerical hue-and-cry against the non-voting conclusions of his non-resistant premises" was joined in by certain abolitionists in western New York, who hoped to capture the anti-slavery societies and convert them into political organizations. The Garrisonians strongly opposed the formation of a third party on principle and as a matter of expediency; as moral propagandists they had great influence; they held the balance of power between the old parties; their agitation rested on the broadest basis. As a political party their small numbers would make them insignificant; they would lay themselves open to a charge of self-seeking, and their opposition to slavery must be restricted to very narrow grounds. The struggle between the new organizationists and the third party men on one side, and the Garrisonians on the other, was not decided until the annual meeting of the American society in 1840. Victory for the Garrisonians depended upon the confirmation by the meeting of Miss Abby Kelly's appointment on the business committee. It was confirmed by one hundred majority. The clerical and political appointees refused to serve with her, saying it was contrary to the usages of civilized society, the gospel and their consciences. The minority then withdrew and formed a new society. The same illiberal spirit triumphed in London,

which Mr. Garrison reached in June; he found the World's anti-slavery convention had declined to receive the credentials of the American female delegates. Declaring their own credentials dishonored by this action, he and the other belated delegates refused to present them, and took places in the gallery, to the great scandal of the meeting. This protest was not without beneficial effect on popular feeling in England.

SARAH MIFFLIN GAY.

IT SHOULD BE A FREE TRADE CONFERENCE.

Referring to the question of a national conference to be held the coming summer, I want to say that if we are to undertake such a thing, let us do it with a set and a practical purpose. I am not in favor of spending money for next to nothing when there is something tangible and desirable to be had for it, and I am therefore decidedly of the opinion that the proposed conference should have the immediate object of forwarding the free trade fight. In other words, I think it should be made a demonstration in which free traders who are not yet single tax men may join, and my notion is that it should aim to have an influence on the congressional nominations and elections of the autumn. Our friends in New South Wales have shown us how to do this thing and the results have vindicated their policy. They have thrown themselves boldly and bodily into the liberal ranks and are pressing the whole body forward infinitely faster than either could go alone. It is an alliance of the utmost practical advantage and importance and events are approving it in the most thorough manner.

It occurs to me that this conference ought to mean something more than a mere reunion. That would be pleasant, but we can have that and something else, too. We can have all the pleasure of personal meetings, and we can at the same time do a great deal to help the cause forward in the great legislative fight in the issue of which we are so deeply concerned. I believe we can get for a free trade conference all the single tax men who would be able to attend any conference at all, and we should also get, I venture to say, such men as Chauncey F. Black, Roger Q. Mills, ex-Governor Morton, Captain Codman, Francis Lynde Stetson, Frank Hurd, Henry Watterson and many others of the same aggressive and radical mold. If this could be done, I fancy that the effect on the great movement in which we are all so deeply concerned would be salutary in the largest measure, and it would also have the effect of nerving the democrats throughout the Union to take a firmer and a more advanced stand in the congressional contest. In my opinion Chicago, the great central city of the United States, should be chosen for the place, and mid-August as the time for such a meeting.

W. W. BAILEY.

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER.

ARID LANDS AND IRRIGATION—SENATOR REAGAN MAKES SOME EXPLANATIONS RELATIVE TO THIS BILL—WHY MAJOR POWELL THINKS IT SHOULD FIND FRIENDS AMONG SINGLE TAX MEN—A FEW PLAIN FACTS ABOUT THE SEAL FISHERIES—THE NEW CONTRACT AND THE OLD ONE—POACHERS—VIEWS OF PROFESSOR ELLIOT—EXIT OF THE WASHINGTON CRITIC FROM REFORM WORK.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 3.—One of the most significant bills introduced into congress during the past week was presented by Senator Reagan of Texas. It provides for the irrigation of the arid lands of the United States. This bill embodies the gigantic plan of Major J. W. Powell, director of the geological survey, and if carried into effect will mark a wide departure in the treatment of public lands and present some features of much interest to votaries of the single tax. When it is remembered that almost half of the territory of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, is comprised of arid lands, a comparatively insignificant part of which have been irrigated, the importance of the subject may be appreciated. There come astonishing stories of the result of cultivation where irrigation has been tried. Lands lying dry and apparently worthless have, when moistened, brought forth an abundance of yield.

(1) William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879. The story of his life told by his children. In four volumes. New York: The Century Company, 1884-1890.

tables, fruits and flowers. Verily the desert is made to bloom.

But no sooner was this discovery made than congress was confronted with the problem of how to put the land into the hands of settlers. Plainly the value of the lands depended upon the supply of water. Yet a general and regular water supply could only be obtained through great hydraulic works, impossible of construction by puny, unassociated, individual efforts. Acts were therefore passed by congress withholding irrigable lands from settlement until it should be better known how to proceed, and a committee was appointed to make a thorough examination of the matter. This committee is now preparing its report. Senator Reagan, who is a member of it, says, respecting the conclusions to which it has come:

We conceived that it would be impracticable to develop the country by individual enterprise; that it must either be done by corporations or by associated communities; that it would not be wise to allow corporations to appropriate land and water and that it was best to provide a system based upon irrigation districts, and in these districts, under the authority of congress and subject to the legislation of the respective states or territories, to give to the people of each irrigation district the control of the land and the water and the timber of the district; to dispose of the land to actual settlers in small tracts of not exceeding eighty acres for irrigation, allowing them collectively to build dams and ditches and make reservoirs and giving them the use and control of their own pasture lands not susceptible of irrigation and cultivation, and giving them the use and control of the timber of their respective irrigation districts to be used by them for domestic purposes, to be protected against fires and to be preserved where it is necessary for the preservation of the water supply.

Senator Reagan's bill provides that the secretary of the interior, through the agency of the irrigation survey, shall cause the arid lands of the United States to be topographically surveyed and "platted" into irrigation districts by hydrographic basins, so that one hydrographic system embracing all of the interdependent waters and lands in relation to irrigation, forest protection and pasture protection, shall be included in each. It shall be the duty of the survey officers to designate not only the irrigable lands, but those lands that can be cultivated with the greatest economy; to designate the location of the trunk sections of the rivers and large creeks and to determine and locate the places where dams and reservoirs may be constructed and the routes which may be followed by canals; and it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation to construct any dam, reservoir or canal upon any site or route not selected and designated by the irrigation survey. All running waters, perennial or intermittent, shall be divided among the irrigation districts in such a manner that the best lands shall be supplied and the largest aggregate result obtained.

All lands designated as irrigable lands may be acquired by individuals in tracts not greater than eighty acres under the homestead act. Mining and coal lands and town sites may be acquired under the existing United States statutes. All other lands in the irrigation districts shall be public lands, to be held for the use of the people of the irrigation districts as forest lands, pasture lands, and catchment areas or sources of supply for the waters to be used in the irrigation districts. The cost of constructing irrigating works is to fall upon the owners of lands irrigated. It shall be lawful for the qualified voters of an irrigation district to organize themselves into a body corporate and politic with powers to sue and be sued.

Whenever the source of water supply or reservoir, dam, canal or other hydraulic work falls within the boundary of another state or territory, the people of the irrigation district shall have jurisdiction over it and not be subject to any tax or obstruction because of it.

"It is the aim of this bill," said Senator Reagan to me in some explanatory remarks, "to provide a complete system reserving the use and control of the cultivable land, the water and the timber in the arid regions to the people of the respective irrigation districts. It was our purpose to formulate a system which, acted upon, might stand for ages—a system that it would not be necessary to change."

"My impression is that if this bill should become a law the great valleys of the Yellowstone, the Colorado, the Snake, the Humboldt, the Carson, the valleys of Utah and the great plains of Arizona and New Mexico may in after years be made great hives of industry. On the other hand, if we allow the matter to drag along without system, the valuable water supplies are liable to fall into the hands of a few persons or corporations, and the settlement of that great region of the country to be indefinitely retarded."

It is too early yet to say what will be the

fate of this bill. Four other irrigation bills have preceded the Reagan bill in the senate, and two have been presented in the house, but none of these are so ambitious in their aims. Major Powell says the Reagan bill has many friends. He thinks single tax men should be among those friends inasmuch as, while the bill does not provide for the single tax, it makes a marked advance toward the recognition of that principle by acknowledging the common right of all the inhabitants of an irrigation district to water, timber and pasture, and it provides that the cost of constructing and operating irrigation works shall fall upon the lands benefited.

The plain facts concerning the seal fisheries about which there seems to be much misinformation are these. Twenty years ago the Alaska commercial company made a contract with the United States government for the exclusive privilege of taking fur seals on the Alaskan islands of St. Paul and St. George, in the Behring sea, guaranteeing to pay \$3.17 for each skin taken. The catch at the beginning was small, and the price commanded by good skins in London, the only market, was about \$6. As the cost of putting a skin in London was \$6.50, the business was conducted for several years at a loss. But backed by an abundance of capital, and skillfully managed, first by General Miller of California and latterly by Louis Sloss of the same state, the business was extended, a demand for seal furs was encouraged, and the price of skins was brought up to \$15. From that time on the profit of the company, after paying \$3.17 to the government, and almost \$4 more for catching, transportation, insurance, commission, etc., was about \$8 on each skin. As the term of the twenty years' lease drew to a close the secretary of the treasury called for bids for a new lease. The Alaska commercial company offered to pay to the United States \$8.75 per skin. This, with the charges of catching, transporting, etc., would bring the cost up to about \$12.50, leaving a profit of \$2.50. Several other competitors made nearly equal bids. But the North American commercial company of New York and San Francisco, of which I. Liebes, an experienced fur dealer, is the nominal president, but of which D. O. Mills, the California millionaire, is the substantial backer, made a bid far ahead of all other competitors, and offered \$10.25 for each skin taken, which at present cost of getting furs to market would leave a profit of but \$1. The secretary of the treasury accepted this offer, and the term of contract begins on May 1 next.

If the catch numbers 100,000 seals \$1,000,000 will be turned into the United States treasury each year hereafter. But it is very doubtful if next year's catch will be so large, and it is quite certain that if present evils continue the catch will rapidly diminish and before long the seals will be extinct. This evil is due to poaching in the waters of Behring sea. The poachers are of all nationalities, but because of the convenience of sailing from Victoria, most of them fly the English flag. Professor Henry W. Elliott of the Smithsonian institution, who has made a careful study of the habits of the seal, informs me that the seals arrive en masse on the islands of St. Paul and St. George to breed and shed their coats in June and July and depart in October and November; that from the time of their departure to the time of their return they land nowhere else. They swim out from the Behring sea into the waters of the North Pacific, passing through the numerous passes of the Aleutian archipelago. The poacher has but a cast anchor in the shallow water of Behring sea, fifty or one hundred miles distant from the seal islands, to shoot, spear and net the seals as they come swimming along, especially the females, who are slower and sleep floating. Now great care has to be exercised in the selecting and killing of the animals on the seal islands for fear of frightening the rest of the herd away. Yet this vigorous and indiscriminate slaughter by poachers has been going on for several years, and steadily growing worse. Professor Elliott expects that unless something is done to prevent it such a fleet of poachers will drop anchor in Behring sea next season, and that the following year's catch on the American seal islands will be reduced to a few thousands.

The chief point in all this for single tax men is that part of the present revenue of the United States is derived directly from the rent of land. It also shows how common ownership may be reconciled with private and exclusive use.

The Washington Critic, the daily newspaper, which a fortnight or three weeks ago began an investigation into the methods of taxing real estate in this city, about which I wrote to THE STANDARD last week, has reverted to its former owners. It now repudi-

ates the radical and wide-awake policy which recently characterized it and sinks back into dullness and conservatism. The Critic's work of taxation investigation is, therefore, at an end, but its recent short and vigorous campaign has bought out a good deal of interesting local information and has excited much thought.

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

Newton, N. J.—Suppose a man has no land, but owns \$100,000, invested in government bonds. How does the single tax propose to reach him?

S. E.

It does not propose to reach him at all, except by making it more profitable to put money into active business than to leave it in bonds.

Government bonds are exempt from taxation. This was one of the inducements originally offered for buying them, and is yet one of the inducements for keeping them. The single tax would offer the same inducement for investing in business.

* * *

The Philadelphia Press is a very conservative high protection partisan paper, and it is considered remarkable to find anything in its columns favorable to the single tax idea; and it will probably be very much shocked when it discovers that it has been advocating anything so heretical. Yet in a late issue it speaks approvingly of the action of the Buffalo authorities, who, when asked for a certain street car franchise, concluded that if it was worth asking for it was worth paying for; so they put it up at auction and sold it for 11 1/4 per cent of the gross earnings of the road when completed. "What a bonanza," says the Press, "Philadelphia would have in its street railways if they paid into its treasury one dollar of every nine which they take in. There would be less dividends of 30 and 40 per cent on the actual cost of the roads, but there would be a much fuller treasury with much lighter taxes. Permanent improvements on a larger scale would be possible, for the city would be in receipt of a handsome annual revenue in return for the use of its streets by railways." Now, if the Press would go a step or two further—to the point where the authorities would take in addition to the annual rental value of the franchises the single tax on the unearned increment, how much more "permanent" could be the improvements, and how much "larger" would be the scale on which they could be carried out! But, no; too much cannot yet be expected from the Press. In time, perhaps, its eyes will be opened still more.

* * *

The Metropolitan iron and land company, which operates the Narre, East Narre and Pabst iron mines in Wisconsin, recently declared a dividend of over twenty-five per cent on its capital stock of \$2,000,000, and its shares, whose par is \$25, are now held at \$75. The company owns mines that will yet yield many millions of tons, and has the double advantage obtained from its own control of natural opportunities, and from the cheapness of labor resulting from the general system of private land ownership. It is refreshing to know that F. W. Rhinelander, one of New York's great land owners, is a stockholder in the company. Others are: Theodore Davis of Newport, R. I., president of the Portage and Lake Superior canal company; Messrs. Roach and Francis Bartlett of Boston, R. C. Hannah of Chicago, S. S. Curry Ishpeming, Mich., and Francis Hinton, H. S. Hasleton, E. L. Bennet and Captain S. Clement of Milwaukee. The eastern stockholders hold the controlling interest.

* * *

The Topeka Capital is a rabid republican protective paper; yet in commenting on the interview had by a newspaper man with Mr. Cleveland, it says: "It matters not what was the inspiring motive, the potent factor in the proceeding is the hold which Mr. Cleveland's doctrine has taken upon the democratic mind. This in connection with the general agreement among the people that the tariff is an overshadowing issue, invests the situation with intense interest. There is one way, and only one, by which Mr. Cleveland can be shorn of his strength, and that is by the enactment, by the present congress, during the present session, of a law reducing the aggregation and the average duties so far below what was proposed by the Mills bill as to leave no room for doubt anywhere that republicans intend to confine protection within the aggregate amount of revenue needed for an economical administration of the government."

* * *

In the opinion of Russell Sage, anyone with intelligence and industry may grow rich. This is an old chestnut. It used to be told at school when we were children, and we used to long for the time when we would be "grown up" so that we could get rich by

"industry." It may have worked in the case of Russell Sage and his sort, who have got rich, not by "industry," but by "working the industrious," but it has not worked in the case of those who have applied themselves, in order to get rich, to what is called "legitimate industry." The fact is that getting "rich" is either a matter of luck or unscrupulousness. The day has gone by when "economy," "thrift," or "industry" will make a person rich, if there ever was such a time.

* * *

A financial concern in Boston offers six and a half per cent interest to all investors and explains that it is enabled to do so because all its investments are in "commercial real estate," which "constantly increases in value." By way of convincing investors these canny financiers present two tables, one for Boston and one for Minneapolis, showing the progressive growth of land values in those two cities as revealed by the assessment books. Of fifteen land parcels in Boston the smallest increment between 1820 and 1880 was from \$21,000 to \$108,000, and the largest, from \$24,000 to \$490,000. Of nearly a score of land parcels in Minneapolis, the smallest increment between 1868 and 1888 was from \$5,000 to \$280,000, this being on a parcel 185x165 feet, and the smallest from \$60 to \$13,750 on a parcel 25x96 feet. The Boston financiers eloquently urge the absurdity of investing in farm mortgages when these fat pickings are to be had. The figures ought to be instructive to the inhabitants of Boston and Minneapolis.

* * *

At a recent meeting of the Boston marketmen's republican club in Boston General John L. Swift, commenting on the statement by Mr. William E. Russell that a new generation had come upon the field in the north which was absolutely uninfluenced by the prejudices of the war, exclaimed: "There is not a man at this table who is uninfluenced by the prejudices of the late war." "Here's one," exclaimed the Rev. William H. Rider, of Gloucester, and the exclamation caused the utmost confusion to General Swift. When the bloody-shirt howler got through, Mr. Rider made a brief speech, declaring that loyalty to the country is better than loyalty to a party, and insisting that old prejudices should not be kept alive and fostered. The speech was received with enthusiastic applause.

* * *

Francis A. Gaffney, in a recent communication to the Dublin Freeman, urges with force and logic the justice and efficacy of the single tax as a remedy for the Irish question. In the same issue a communication with the familiar and colorless signature, "Pro Bono Publico," admirably sets forth the injustice of the seizure by landlords of commons and wild mountain land in Ireland. The correspondent shows that the unimproved moors and mountains are as clearly public property as the air we breathe.

* * *

Saginaw, Mich.—A and B own adjoining tracts of land of equal value and productivity. At the end of ten years the improvements that each has made in the shape of buildings, fences, etc., are equal in value; but A has worked very hard, early and late, and by means of thorough cultivation has brought his land to the highest state of productivity, while B has been content to cultivate his land in a slipshod manner, and as a result his land is no more productive than in the beginning. Now it is obvious that A's land has a greater rental value than B's, not by reason of improvements on A's land, but by reason of improvements in his land, the direct result of the exertion of his labor. How are you going to avoid taxing A on one of the products of his labor.

W. P. BOLAND.

Whenever it appears that labor in any form would be put at a disadvantage under the single tax you may be sure there is something wrong in your idea of the operation of the single tax. Its great object is to relieve labor from artificial burdens and to make it free. The single tax does not fall upon improvements whether they are on the land or in the land. It would tax improved land for precisely what it would tax the same land if it had not been improved. In the cases you mention, both tracts having been of equal value and the productions of the one having been increased by labor and that of the other remaining as it was in the beginning, both A and B would be taxed alike. And the taxes of neither would be any more than when they took up their tracts, unless B's land rose in value despite his slipshod cultivation.

* * *

The editor of the San Francisco Star has received so many applications for the complete poems of Mrs. Frances M. Milne, that he has resolved to issue them in book form. They will be elegantly printed, in large type, on the best calandered paper, and handsomely bound. The price will be \$3. As this will be what is called the "author's edition," the expense of publication will necessarily be great. He asks, therefore,

that all who can afford it, will at once send in their names to the Weekly Star, San Francisco, Cal., for one or more copies. The money need not be paid until the work is completed and the book delivered. The readers of THE STANDARD and the Star are familiar with Mrs. Milne's poems, and not one word need be said by us in their praise. They speak eloquently for themselves.

* * *

"Huxley and Rousseau" is the title of an editorial article in a recent issue of the Home Journal of this city. The article considers Huxley's contemptuous assault upon the idea that "all men are born free and equal," and explains that the equality here intended is the "Unity, the commoners of the nature of men—an equality from which flows an equality of fundamental rights." The editor esteems it the glory of modern democracy that it does not take its rise from considerations of mere expediency. It finds its finger post of guidance on that "high prior" road which Huxley thinks leads to a quagmire. The editor defends Rousseau from the charge of absurdity, and declares that even in this country there is need of a revival of Rousseauism or Jeffersonianism.

* * *

The society of Christian socialists has just been formed at a small meeting held in All Souls' church, Madison avenue and Sixty-sixth street. The Rev. R. Heber Newton has accepted the presidency of the society, and the Rev. Dr. James M. Whiton aided in the work of organization. The programme of the society, said to have been drawn up by Mr. Newton, includes among other things:

To work for special measures of reform as may be practicable; industrial education, shortened hours of labor, improved conditions of labor, the identification of the interests of employers and employees, more equitable taxation, control or ownership by the city, state or nation of natural monopolies, and the reassertion of the underlying right of the commonwealth over land in the interests of the people at large.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

THE PATENT OUTSIDES.

To the Editor of The Standard—Sir: Some time ago I received a copy of the Memphis Weekly Appeal of December 25, containing the single tax column, in which I noticed the following: "We will arrange that every paper published through the medium of the A. N. Kellogg newspaper company, the Western newspaper company, or any other similar concern, shall be furnished free of cost with two columns of single tax matter each week. Write to your local paper and urge upon the editor the propriety of communicating with us on the subject." I wrote to the editor of the Grant County Review, who gets his papers from the A. N. Kellogg company. This week the patent side of the Review has the two columns of single tax matter. I shall now use the same as a leverage to get other South Dakota editors to do likewise. I think it would be well to call the attention of STANDARD readers to this opportunity the Memphis men have opened to us. Much good may come therefrom.

Bristol, S. Dak.

W. E. BROKAW.

IMPERIALISM THREATENED.

To the Editor of the Standard—Sir: A bill has recently been introduced in congress giving the president of the United States direct power to call out the militia of the several states when in his opinion circumstances make it necessary for him to do so.

It will be well for all who believe that the existing order of things may be changed with benefit to the majority of the people to keep an eye on this bill. It places practically at the disposal of the president an additional standing army of 130,000 men. Mr. Shearman has shown us that plutocracy has already come; the history of all past republics shows the next step to be a standing army, followed by an empire.

The promoters of the bill will no doubt offer very plausible reasons why it should become law. The old ones were the necessity of protection against foreign foes, etc., etc. The late rebellion showed that the president of the United States has power enough under the constitution to defend and preserve the government. Harrison and his successors need no more men subject to their orders in time of peace than had Lincoln when he entered the office. It is difficult to believe that there can possibly be a combination of circumstances where they would have more difficulties to overcome than he had.

OLIVER CROMWELL.

St. Louis, Feb. 20, 1890.

MR. TELLER SEES SOME THINGS.

To the Editor of The Standard—Sir: I beg to call your attention to page 1,181, Congressional Record, date February 12, on which Senator Teller of Colorado, late secretary of the interior, is quoted as follows:

On this question I have some peculiar and personal views which I have entertained all my life. I believe that the land system in

this country has been in many respects an unfortunate one. I believe in the doctrine that no man is entitled to any land except what he works and tills, or upon which he lives, and I believe that the highest state of civilization is to come to a people who would preserve intact all its land for those who make personal and individual use of it.

Greely, Col. G. W. CURRIER.

POWDERLY TO SLOAN.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA AND WESTERN INVITED TO SEE THE MISERIES OF HIS OWN MINERS

General Master Workman Terence V. Powderly has been writing to the World about the condition of coal miners in the Wyoming valley of Pennsylvania. Here is a sample case, the story of one miner:

I came to this country three years ago, and have a wife and three children depending on me for support. I have five rooms here; they are not plastered, but I make them as comfortable as I can and pay \$6 rent. For every ton of coal I buy I pay \$2.40, and I use a ton a month. From December, 1889, to December 1890, I averaged eight days and a half a month, which brought me about \$20 a month. In December last I drew \$16, and in January \$11.25. I work for the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western company, and as that corporation operates no company stores I must pay cash for everything I eat. The storekeeper told me yesterday that I could get no more food unless I paid cash for it. I am not the owner of one shilling and don't know where the next meal is to come from. This morning the assistant coal agent of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western company came through here. He noticed that the teamster who delivers coal to the workmen uses narrow side boards on his wagon, placed there to keep the coal from shaking and use them no more. He was afraid that our little ones would get the benefit of one p. and more of coal to keep us warm.

I have bought no meat in months, and when the butcher stops before the door with his wagon my wife goes out and tells him that we don't need any to-day. My God, don't need any! and my very inwards craving for a taste of it. My children in want of it and nothing for them but coarse bread when we can get it, and God alone knows where we poor people in this place are to get food for the next few months. Why, I would leave this place in five minutes if I could get away, but I have never been able to put \$2 together since I reached here, and I can't walk away with the wife and children on my back.

One month my doctor bill was \$7, and I thought it would be cheaper for me to do as the others do and subscribe \$1 a month to the doctor fund for the future. I did it right along, but one month I was not able and had to let it slip. The next week I had sickness in the family and went for Dr. Houser, who refused to come. He did not tell me that he would not come, or that it was because I had not contributed my dollar, but he did not reach my little shanty just the same and we had to get along without him. I was docked two ears last month and this month have not worked a moment yet.

Mr. Powderly adds:

I stood beneath another roof and saw a delicate little woman walking the floor in a vain attempt to soothe a crying child to sleep. The mother, too, was weeping, and she told me that her husband had not brought enough into the house for months to keep them in food for a week. She was crying with the hunger.

One young man asked for outside work, such as attending to boilers, wheeling ashes or attending to repairs on the breakers, and was refused. Before his very eyes a Slav applied for the situation and was accepted. When the Slav was hired he knelt before the boss, took his hand and kissed it. * * *

The president of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western company is Samuel Sloan. He has his residence in New York city and a summer home up along the Hudson. He bears a good reputation among the people of New York and gives many dollars to charity. He never goes among the men who pile up his wealth for him. He knows nothing of their real worth, but they stand his equal in all that goes to make a man. One day Samuel Sloan will die. His God will call him home, and when his will is read it may develop that he has bequeathed thousands, if not millions, of dollars to charitable institutions. He will be praised for his generosity, after he is dead, but if he would be just as well as charitable he would come up here and go among the men who pile up for him the wealth that one day he will leave behind. He will see children, the future hope of the nation, crying for bread which one stroke of his pen could give. He will see men—strong, good, honest men—striving to keep back the feeling that makes anarchy show its head, and he will learn a startling lesson which will cause him to think better of us here in this supposed-to-be wild region. He need not be afraid of these men, for he may go along among them and they, though crying with the hunger as they are, would not harm a hair of his head. If he fears them, if he believes the stories that have been told of them, I will go with him and guarantee him absolute protection while showing him the gaunt, half-starved frames of the men who mine the coal on which his fortune is made. Will he come?

SOCIETY NOTES.

Washington, Feb. 25.—The dinner given to-night by Mr. Andrew Carnegie to the president and cabinet, and the delegates and officers of the international American conference, was one of the most elegant affairs of the kind ever given in Washington. The arrangements, which were novel and unique, were planned by him. The walls of the large new dining room at the Arlington hotel were literally banked with spring flowers. The table was circular in form, thirty-six feet in diameter, and covers were laid for forty-eight gentlemen. The center of the table was a mammoth four-leaved clover of maiden-hair fern, over which was suspended a huge silver lamp, the brilliancy of which was softened by festoons of seaweed that dropped into the maiden-hair. The angles between the leaves of the clover were filled with solid masses of orchids, tulips, and crocuses, there being thousands of blossoms, which were collected in New Orleans, Mobile, Savannah, Pensacola, Jacksonville, and other cities of the south, as well as in the greenhouses of Philadelphia, New York, Newport, and Boston.

The bill of fare consisted of oysters on the shell, clear turtle soup, broiled sole from England, with cold cauliflower; broiled breasts of spring chickens from Louisiana, with hot asparagus; roasted spring lamb from Scotland; teal ducks from Currituck sound, North Carolina, and the usual deserts. The wines were Chateau Yquem, "Twelve Apostles" sherry, Chateau Lafitte, Royal Burton Sec, and some rare Madeira.

The menu was engraved in fine script upon heavy bevelled blocks of papier-mâché, and no French terms were used. Every particle of food was described in plain English. In the upper left-hand corner of the block were the initials of Mr. Carnegie in two shades of green, white the name of the guest, by a new and peculiar process, blown in glass at the bottom.

During the dinner a vocal and instrumental concert was given instead of the ordinary orchestral music. Miss Marie Deeca, Miss Elizabeth Johnson, Mr. Herndon Morsell, and the Schubert quartet gave the vocal numbers, Miss Alice Raymond played a cornet solo, Mr. Ernst Lent a solo on the violoncello, Messrs. Elkstein and Andrews a duet for zithers, and Mr. Alexander presided at the piano. There were no formal speeches.—[Dispatch to New York Times.]

PUNXSUTAWNEY, Feb. 25.—I wanted to see now that the strike is fully on, how the strikers are really faring; in what sort of condition they were starting off upon this new test of endurance. So in the afternoon I set off on foot, with the master workman, to visit the huts where some of the strikers had taken shelter. Out over roads where the mud and water stood half-knee deep we climbed, and reaching the open country cut into the fields, where the snow lay.

At a red house, on the skirt of a wood, we stopped. Within the shabby house was a tall old woman, with her widowed daughter and two grandchildren. The old lady had the accent of Durham and Northumberland, and from her fiery talk and exultation when told that the men, in meeting, had decided not to back down, I learned that it isn't the men who are the backbone of the Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg strike. Her son, she said, had died from miner's consumption, and now that her old husband was out on strike all they had was \$2 a week for the five of them. The last wages the old man drew, she said, was \$12.49 for fifteen day's work. "We came here in July, and I promise ye we hain't had \$7 in cash a-comin' at pay days altogether. The last two times there was nothin' at all, an' ye may be sure ye'll get no goods at the company's stores unless ye've the coal already to show for 'em. Many's the one's gone after a little sugar or tea before the strike, and been told they couldn't get it—there was nothin' comin' to 'em. We had to pay \$5 for our wee bit house, and then the hospital and the doctor—there was \$1.10 for nothin'. We never saw the doctor, and if my man was sick d'y'e think I'd let him go to the 'ospit al? No, says I. I keep him here and care for him myself. Why, sir, only one man ever come out of the 'ospit alive."

In the next house, half a mile away, lived a young fellow and his wife. They were sitting before the cook stove in the one room they could call theirs. There was no carpet on the floor, but it was neat and clean. There were cracks between the boards on the outside of the house, through which, as I sat there, I could see blue sky and the waving branches of the pines in the wood hard by. The cold wind came up briskly through the flooring, and I believed the young miner when he told me that the 'ouse was kinder cold."

The small housewife, when asked what sort of living they had been able to make out, said it was pretty slim, but that there being only two of them they did better than others who had big families.

"But the mine people tell me the men can average from \$65 to \$100 a month."

The young fellow and his wife both looked at each other and laughed feebly in derision.

"Well," he said, "figures won't lie, especially when they're in the company's writing. Here's something that'll come near showin' the truth."

He pulled from the cupboard a lot of checks of the semi-monthly payments at the mine.

These dirty scraps of paper showed the amount he had earned and the sum that had been paid him in cash out of it. One two weeks when he had earned \$8, there had been \$1.05 remaining out of it to be paid in currency; out of \$17.30, a balance of \$1.95; out of \$5.46, \$5.16; out of \$13.92, \$1.82; out of \$13.50, \$2.35; out of \$11.70, nothing. That last is what they call a "black snake."

"Up the snowy road," Wilson, said I, "a man told me yesterday that he had made many a meal, since the strike, off bread and water."

"Well," the young leader answered, "that's not uncommon. You will find that there are a sight of strikers who have been doing that. Turn to the right here."

There was a low one story building, unpainted and storm-beaten, which was half like a tenement and half like the boiler-house at an oil well. Two or three chickens were picking in the dirt before the door, and there were scraps of broken furniture and crockery and a few bits of coal. In this little shed—for that was all it amounted to—there were two families quartered, and under its low roof I saw a sight which could not fail to inspire pity. In one room, and a cupboard which passed under the name of bedroom, a woman, shabbily dressed and with a worn, tired face, sat nursing from the breast a babe born since the beginning of the strike. About her were six other children, all girls, ragged and wan. The eldest could not have been more than eleven, and, except some photographs taken during famine in India and the horrid pictures which hung on the walls at the rooms of the S. P. C. C., on Twenty-third street, I have never seen more wretched emaciation. Of the other children two were simply beautiful.

"The strike is hard on the children," said the woman, looking around upon her flock.

"There are a great many things they ought to have, but which we can't get for them. They need clothes and they need milk. We are virtually starving to death here."

The woman's voice, her appearance and the wretched room where they were told a sad story of utter want, dejection and despair.

There was a stove, a table, a wash-bench, two chairs and a box on which the children sat, feebly amusing themselves with the tattered covers—the covers merely—of an old picture-book. A scant fire was in the stove. I asked the woman where her husband was.

"Oh," she said, "he only comes home to sleep. We have so little food that it's not enough for the children and me, let alone the man. He's a good soul, and he manages to get a meal of some sort away somewhere, so as to let us have all the relief committee furnishes." —[Correspondence New York World.]

PERSONAL.

The New York Union Printer of March 1 prints a vignette of John Lavis, secretary of the Dorchester, Boston, single tax club, and one of the ablest advocates of the doctrine in Massachusetts. The Union Printer says Mr. Lavis "is one of the most energetic and justly popular members of the Boston typographical union. He was born in London, England, June 6, 1851, of Irish parents, and arrived in the city of culture and east winds when only ten months old. His father having been killed at the battle of the Wilderness, John was compelled at an early age to go to work. He entered the office of Dakin & Co., Boston, for a beginning, and afterward worked on John Stetson's Illustrated News, on the Herald and all the principal offices in Boston. For the past seven years he has been employed on the Traveller. Mr. Lavis takes an active interest in the labor movement. He was at one time secretary of the largest K. of L. assembly in Boston. He is now secretary of the Dorchester single tax club. He has been a faithful and consistent unionist and an influential speaker and worker in No. 13. Through his persistent efforts the Boston Directory office was unionized, and the number of union men in the Traveller office were increased from two to thirty."

J. B. Packard of St. Paul, Neb., is having a stout wrestle on the single tax with the editor of the Democrat of that city. Keep at him, Mr. Packard; your man seems to want to know, and therefore can be won over.

Daniel Beard, the artist, says that "the single tax is getting to be so darned respectable he thinks he will have to retire from the business;" bat writes T. E. Lane, when he leaves the single tax movement it will be when he is dead and the single tax is in full operation.

THAT'S IT EXACTLY.

Pendleton East Oregonian. What is "protection"? It is taking from a thousand men what they need and deserve, and giving it to one man who neither needs nor deserves it.

HOW SEVERE!

Boston Labor Leader. Benjamin Tucker said that Henry George "went up like a rocket" and would "go down like a stick." He is further of opinion that the descent has commenced.

PROFESSOR HUXLEY ON HENRY GEORGE.

A REPLY BY THE ORGAN OF THE LIVERPOOL FINANCIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION TO MR. HUXLEY'S ARTICLE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Liverpool Financial Reformer.

Poor Henry George! A few months ago we noticed a charge brought against him that he had stolen his ideas from Dove, and now we have Professor Huxley assuring us in the Nineteenth Century that the ideas are so crude and illogical as not to be worth stealing. With the attack upon Mr. George in itself we, of course, need not concern ourselves, but Professor Huxley's article involves, in its sweeping condemnation, the principle of perfect freedom of trade, and the taxation of land values which we have succeeded in getting partially embodied in the liberal programme. We do hold that men have a right to be allowed to earn an honest living, and we further protest against state interference with that right, either by tariffs or bad land laws.

By way of illustrating the fact that there are in reality no "natural rights" the professor relates a story of an unfortunate villager in India who was carried off by a tigress and set down for her cubs to play with as a cat brings a mouse to her kittens; and he argues that the tiger in eating men is only doing what its nature prompts it to do in order to preserve its existence, that is, exercises a natural right, and goes on to say: "If, then, we deny that tigers have a natural right to torment and devour men, we really impeach, not the conduct of the tigers but the order of nature, and if we ourselves, with our notions of right and wrong are, like the tigers, products of that order, whence comes our competence to deny the exercise of their natural rights to those beings who stand upon the same foundation of natural rights as ourselves. To say that a thing exists in nature, and to say that it has a natural right to existence, are in fact merely two ways of expressing the same truth, which is, that, in nature, fact and justification of the fact, or in other words, might and right, are co-extensive. To be and to have a natural right to be, to possess a faculty and to have the natural right to exert it, are all one." * * * Beyond a doubt, by "the law of nature," which is the foundation of "natural right," the cats and their carnivorous allies are justified." For the full elaboration of the argument we must refer our readers to the Nineteenth Century; it is too long to give here, but from what we have said it can easily be perceived that Professor Huxley is hopelessly confused, and considers "natural right" the same as "natural inclination." The tiger has no right to eat men, though undoubtedly it has the inclination to do so. A right involves a corresponding duty—if A has a right to certain services from B, it is the duty of B to perform those services to A. If the tiger has a right to eat a man it is the man's duty to allow the tiger to eat him. Henry George has been accused of reading Dove; let us introduce Dove's works to Professor Huxley also. On p. 133 of the "Elements of Political Science," Dove asks the very question, "Are all men equal in natural rights?" and he says "There are three regions to which we may address ourselves for an answer. First, Scripture; second, Reason; third, Observation." The first we need not trouble the professor with. In regard to reason, Dove says:

Reason teaches us that rights arise out of the universality of the moral law. As regards a lion or a tiger, I have no rights; he slays me if he can, and I destroy him if I can, in circumstances where he appears likely to be dangerous. We never attribute to him the power of conceiving a moral law, and therefore we never attach to his actions those judgments which we invariably pass upon the acts of men. With men it is otherwise; reason tells us that men ought not to murder, to steal, or to defraud. But if one man is bound by a moral law to refrain from murdering or defrauding, every other man thereby acquires a moral right to be unmurdered and undefrauded. Rights therefore, arise from the universality of the moral law, and the only question is, is the same moral law universally binding upon men? for if it is, all men are necessarily equal in natural rights.

But the professor says: "If the advocate of the 'rights of tigers' attempts to drive us into the further admission that as tigers have a right to eat men, it is wrong of men to put obstacles in the way of them having their rights by refusing to be eaten. We protest against the doctrine, not on the low and selfish ground of mere personal interest, but because, however plausible, it is a patent fallacy. The champion of the 'rights of tigers' has, in fact, made a convenient, though unwarrantable jump from one sense of the word 'right' to another—from 'natural' right to 'moral' right." But it is Professor Huxley who is the champion of the "rights of tigers;" we deny that the tiger has a right to eat men, though we admit he has a natural inclina-

tion to do so. Men and tigers are totally distinct from each other; even Professor Huxley has failed to discover the missing link which makes men and beasts brethren, while there is no such difference between man and man. If the tiger, as an animal, has a "right" to eat men, man, as an animal, has an equal right to defend himself. It is simply begging the question to say that because what Professor Huxley chooses to term the natural "rights of tigers" is opposed to the natural right of man, that therefore there can be no true doctrine of natural rights as between man and man. The whole argument is founded upon a quibble as to the meaning of the term "natural" right.

Further on Mr. Huxley says:

The political delusions which spring from the "natural rights" doctrine are multitudinous; but I think there is only one more which is worth attention at present. That is the extraordinary notion that the logical consequence of the "natural right" of all men to any given thing is the sharing of the right of property in that thing equally among all the claimants. Let us suppose two boys, John and Peter. I take an apple out of my pocket, and I say: "This apple is entirely yours, John; and Peter, it is also entirely yours. The whole apple belongs to each of you, and you have each a right to eat the whole of it. Now, my boys, you may eat it so long as neither of you gives up any fraction of the right I have given him, nor infringes the other's right." The boys, I take it, would be somewhat puzzled.

Doubtless they would; Peter especially would wonder how the professor, having given the apple entirely to John, manages to regain possession of it to give it entirely to him. But will Mr. Huxley kindly point out where Henry George is guilty of any such absurdity. He evidently thinks Henry George considers that everybody has private property in the whole land, whereas George maintains that no one has private property in any of it. He has not taken the trouble to read the book he is attempting to ridicule. But leaving the private property out of the question, Mr. Huxley makes George out to say that everyone has a claim to the whole of the land. George declares everyone has an equal right to the use of it. The one is sense, the professor's illustration nonsense. It is impossible for John and Peter each to have entire possession of the apple at one and the same time, but it is quite possible for them each to have an equal claim to it, i.e., each to own half. Had Professor Huxley read "Progress and Poverty" he would have known that Henry George proposes to take the value of land by taxation, and spend it for the good of the community in that way; and that land values having been absorbed by taxation, men would be unable to keep land out of use or put to an inferior use, either for motives of gain or pleasure, and in that way everyone who wanted to use land could use it, while no one could afford to keep useful land unless he put it to use, for he would need to pay its full "use" value in rental to the community.

After having dealt for eleven and a half pages with natural rights, the learned professor begins his criticism on "Progress and Poverty" itself, and after a series of quotations settles upon the following: "What constitutes the rightful basis of property? What is it that enables a man to say justly of a thing, 'It is mine?' Is it not, primarily, the right of a man to himself, to the use of his own powers, to the enjoyment of the fruits of his own exertions?" (Progress and Poverty, page 236.) In regard to this he says:

And, on the same page, we are told that the title to everything produced in human exertions "descends from the original producer in whom it is vested by natural law." Here we are back again on the ground of the "law of nature" and "natural rights," according to which we have seen a man has a right to keep anything he is strong enough to keep, whether he has produced it or not. But the law of nature affords not the least reason why another man who is stronger should not take his possessions away from him.

Unfortunately for his argument, "we have seen" nothing of the kind. We do not admit that force can transform a wrong into a right, and we would remind this champion of landlordism that his doctrine is not a safe one to preach to the masses, for they, without the shadow of a doubt, have the power on their side. And what are we to think of his next argument? "A man may justly" (Mr. Huxley will excuse our emphasising the word) "say that it is no more than the 'use of his own powers' to knock another down and rob" (again we use the italics) "him of his dinner." Science may have discovered that it is just to rob another: we prefer the old moral law, "Thou shalt not steal." If Professor Huxley continues long in the arena of political discussion we will require a new vocabulary for the old terms, and words expressive of right and wrong, duty and crime, will, in his use, have lost their original meaning. With equal wit he goes on to argue that "a man can have no exclusive possession of himself, except in so far as he is the prod-

uct of the exertions of his own labor, and not a gratuitous offering of nature." This is on a par with his "natural right of tigers," and even he seems to think he has wasted enough time and space, to say nothing of the patience of his readers, in frivolous "logic chopping," to use his own phrase, and goes on to deal with Mr. George's arguments as they would be understood by an ordinary mortal. George protests against the misuse of the word "property," and contends that land can not be property in the sense in which the products of labor are property, one being "a gratuitous offering of nature," the other having been "brought into being by human exertion." Mr. Huxley contends that you cannot draw the distinction because labor must have some product of nature to work upon. He says: "Progress and Poverty" sets before us the case of a steel pen with much elaboration (p. 236), but the author fails to notice the patent fact that the iron ore, the existence of which is the *conditio sine qua non* of that of the pen, is a gratuitous offering of nature." Now, we have a right to complain of such argument. Had the book been one dealing with some phase of natural history, Mr. Huxley would have studied it before expressing an opinion, but as "Progress and Poverty" merely deals with questions involving the happiness or misery of millions of human beings, he is contented to skim it through, and then rush into print and expose its "fallacies." It is only with the iron ore George claims any right of interference, with the labor he has nothing to do. It is the private ownership in mineral he objects to, it is the value of the mineral he claims for the community; the labor he holds is the property of the laborer. That is the whole tenor of the book, and if Professor Huxley had really perceived this he would not have quibbled at the illustration, for everyone must admit that the absolute value of the iron ore in a single pen is practically nil, and, therefore, it might fairly be used to illustrate the difference between that which is the gift of nature and the product of labor. So far from having "failed to observe the patent fact that the iron ore is a gratuitous offering of nature," George himself anticipated the professor's argument, for on p. 115 he says: "Labor can only be exerted on land, and it is from land that the matter which it transmutes into wealth must be drawn."

The point which draws forth the severest censure is the following: "But it will be said, 'There are improvements which in time become indistinguishable from the land itself.' Very well; then the title to the improvements become blended with the title to the land; the individual right is lost in the common right." Our critic says: "What answer is appropriate to such stuff as this but Mr. Burchell's famous, if impolite, monosyllabic 'Fudge!'" But not so fast, Mr. Huxley; let us examine it a little. Much of the land in this country has been reclaimed, but this reclaiming took place a long time ago. It was reclaimed in order that its products might be sold, and in receiving the price of these products the man recovered, bit by bit, the capital he had spent in drainage, etc. In course of years his claim to compensation must become less and less, until it really becomes extinct. The land was reclaimed not from motives of humanity, but in view of prospective profits, and the cost was recouped by the receipt of those profits.

Mr. Huxley's article fills twenty-three pages of the Nineteenth Century, and we would require at least an equal amount of space to deal fully with his various objections. His last one, however, is of great interest, because it is one the Speaker thinks was so ably dealt with by Mr. A. J. Balfour. Mr. Huxley says: "The London infant has no more title to the duke of Westminster's land, and the New York baby no more to Messrs. Astor's land, than the child of a North American squaw, or a native Australian, or of a Hottentot. Property of the community, forsoteth! What right has any community, from a village to a nation, to several property in land more than an individual man has." The passage this refers to will be found on page 240 of "Progress and Poverty." Mr. Balfour, after quoting this passage, said: "We should add, 'and the most degraded savage in the South Sea islands has as much right as the London child,' not forgetting to conclude with Mr. George that 'he is robbed if his right is denied.'"

Now this argument is partly true and partly false. We would congratulate Mr. Huxley upon having at the tail end of his article discovered that the multiplication of wrongs does not make a right. It is quite true that if it be wrong in an individual to have private property in land, it is equally wrong for a community or nation. But it would take too much space to go into that question here, nor is it necessary. We are dealing with Henry George's proposition, which is to ap-

propriate the value of the land, the economic rent from the community, and the question is: Has the South Sea Islander or the Hottentot any claim to a share of the proceeds? We say no. Let us take London for example. Land in London is very valuable. The people of the United Kingdom have a claim to a share in that value, but the South Sea Islander has not. For, assume that the population or the trade and industry of the rest of the United Kingdom is swept away, the value of land in London would fall almost to nothing. It is the population and the industry of the United Kingdom which for the most part produce the value of London. Having produced the value, they have a right to their property in it. But let a volcanic eruption submerge the South Sea islands, would the value of land in London fall? Practically, no. Therefore, not having produced the value, they have no property in it. The same argument will apply to any other portion or portions of the United Kingdom. Theoretically, of course, every country with which we trade increases the value of our land, for it is exchangedability of the products which gives the value to land. But we exchange products, and therefore we add a value to the lands we trade with equal to that which they give to our land. If they have a claim upon us we have a claim to an equal amount upon them, and the two claims cancel each other. It may be said all portions of the United Kingdom have not an equal claim in the value of the land of the whole country, but that would be remedied by the comparative amounts used for local as compared with imperial purposes. If the whole world were one vast nation under one government, and with intercourse between all portions of it, each individual might claim a share in the total value of the land, and his share would be determined in a similar way to that in which we would apportion that of the inhabitants of the different parts of any one nation, viz., the comparative amount expended for imperial and local purposes. But we need not trouble our heads about the South Sea Islander, for, practically, any claim he has against us is cancelled by our equal claim against him.

The Speaker says: "Of course all sober men will agree with Mr. Huxley that to base either attack or defense in the case of existing institutions, on what are called natural rights, is irrational in itself, and mischievous in its results." But we can imagine the professor laughing at his would-be ally, when a few lines further on it urges that we have no natural rights, but we have "social rights;" and goes on to say: "What does social right mean? It means this—that the end of government institutions is the happiness of the governed and not the happiness of a caste or a class; that the standing order of things within the social union should be made conducive to the interests of all; that the interests of all are best served, as experience has shown, by recognizing in each the right, not natural but social, to the fruits of his industry, freedom of his person, equality before the law, and so forth." The above sentence (the italics are ours) really concedes everything, for it would be easy to show that owing to the monopoly by the few of that which evidently is intended for all, a man is denied "the right to the fruits of his industry, freedom of his person," etc., and therefore, in the interests of "social right" this monopoly which Professor Huxley defends must be abolished, and the "social right" of the Speaker soon perceived to be the "natural right" of Henry George. There is one thing in regard to Mr. Huxley's article upon which we can congratulate ourselves. Probably one of the finest things Henry George ever wrote was his reply to the duke of Argyll, and when he returns from Australia we can confidently anticipate a literary and philosophical treat in his reply to Professor Huxley's "Natural Rights and Political Rights."

DISCUSSION'S THE THING.
Omaha Republican.

Our economic system is not perfect; there is much unrest among the masses, and when able men discuss new ideas, thoughtful people will investigate. Good often comes of discussion, and it is better to examine than to ridicule new ideas.

IT IS THE SWORD OF DAMOCLES.
J. K. Sovereign, M. W. of L., Iowa.

It is the monopolization of natural bounties and the unjust distribution of labor that hovers like a nightmare over every social and political fabric of the republic.

PROTECTED LABOR.
Puck.

Mrs. Pigment—Why, what brings you home this time o'day? You said you expected a big job painting "Protection to American Labor" banners.

Mr. Pigment (a sign painter)—I couldn't get the job. A fellow from Castle garden offered to do it at half my wage.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

LAND PURCHASE IN IRELAND.
T. W. Russell, M. P., urges in the Fortnightly Review for February the necessity for a gigantic Irish land purchase scheme. He is convinced that the Ashbourne act has been eminently successful, and he regards a comprehensive scheme of land purchase as the cure for the Irish trouble, since he sees, as he says Mr. Bright saw in 1869, that the land question was at the bottom of Irish discontent. He conceives that the problem is fourfold, since it has to do with the congested western districts, the encumbered estates, the eastern portion of Ireland and the financial question. The task is probably the greatest set before a government in the present century, thinks Mr. Russell, but it must be accomplished to maintain the unionist contention that the imperial parliament is capable of governing Ireland better than any Irish parliament could govern her.

The congested west must be thinned out, because the people here are scarcely farmers and cannot be helped by the Ashbourne act, since that would merely transform poor tenants into poor freeholders. As to the encumbered estates, they should be sold for what they will fetch in the open market regardless of the mortgage holder. If that person has made a bad investment it is his own misfortune. As for the rest of Ireland, especially Ulster, where prosperous lease holders pay rents with a regularity that makes landlords unwilling to sell, the demand of the lease holders for compulsory sale must be treated with respect. Possibly such lands might be sold at higher rates, and the government might make a longer term of payment. Mr. Russell admits, in discussing the financial question, that compulsory sale would cost the government £100,000,000; but he believes that the country is needlessly alarmed on this head. The work of abolishing dual ownership must begin; the land commission must be reconstituted and merged with the landed estates court so as to form a great state department for the management of Irish land; local guarantees for advances should be provided and arrangements made to have credit or money available as fast as land can be transferred. Mr. Russell closes with the boast that Ireland has been in a measure pacified, and gives the glory to Balfour and Lord Salisbury.

FEDERAL OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS.

Professor R. A. Schellhous of Selma, Iowa, sets forth through an interview in the Ottumwa World his scheme for the construction and operation of railways to be owned by the federal government. The scheme contemplates a permanent United States department of passengers and freight; a committee on construction, composed of one person from each state, to be elected for two years by popular vote; the construction by the federal government of such roads as shall be recommended by the department and approved by congress; the purchase of existing lines in the same manner; the fixing of rates, at a small percentage above cost of maintenance, by the department, aided by a committee on cost of carriage, constituted and elected as is the committee on construction, and the appointment by the states, of boards of contractors in different counties, who shall, under the department's guidance and control, make contracts for labor, material and supplies, each board to act within its own jurisdiction, and whose awards shall be subject to rejection by a special contract bureau of the department, who shall be governed by regulations given by the secretary of the department, and approved by the committee on construction, or to approval on attestation of the secretary.

The financial provisions of Professor Schellhous's scheme are curious. He says:

And from the financial bureau of the department, and attested by its secretary, shall be issued coupon drafts in such form and denominations as shall be directed by the secretary and approved by congress, in such sum as shall be annually ordered by act of congress, in payment for labor, material or supplies used in the work of construction; said coupon drafts to amount in the aggregate to no more than two-thirds of the estimated cost of construction.

All coupon drafts issued in payment of labor or supplies used in work of construction shall be dated and marked "issued on construction," and shall be receivable at par value in payment for all rates, charges or tickets for freight or passage on the United States railroads. A rate of interest not to exceed five per cent per annum shall accrue on all coupon drafts issued on construction, such interest to be paid annually, and in United States railroad coupon drafts or tickets only.

Proper discrimination shall be made and such preference given as shall be deemed right and expedient by the secretary of the department to all freights or passage for the payment of which coupon drafts, "issued on construction," are tendered.

It shall be a penal offense for any person to buy or sell United States railroad coupon drafts at a greater premium than ten per cent or at a discount of more than ten per cent.

REFLECTIONS ON CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

"Do the People Wish Reform?" is the title of an article by Albert B. Hart in the March Forum. He means civil service reform, and his answer is, in effect, "Yes; but not much." Mr. Hart believes the evils of political appointment, if unchecked, likely to destroy popular government, and regards the current remedy as good so far as it goes. The president would always be glad to avoid the nuisance of removals and appointments if his party would let him; heads of departments look at it in the same way; and even congressmen are not so attached to the spoils system as some reformers think them, though undoubtedly many members regard it as necessary and desirable. They are not convinced that the people desire the reform because the people do not show any eagerness upon the subject. The people themselves are not enthusiastic because the reform runs counter to their notions about rotation in office, and involves a belief in special aptitude of various individuals, a belief that most Americans do not entertain, since they have long been accustomed to believe that any man can do almost anything. Mr. Hart regards the difficulty of bringing postmasters within the workings of the civil service law as a serious obstacle to its extension, but suggests no remedy. The average American does not realize that an extravagant and insufficient government is costly to himself, chiefly because the indirect federal taxation is not felt as it should be felt. Mr. Hart thinks as population increases and virgin soil and forests are exhausted, the burden of government will be more felt. If this reform could be separated from other questions it would probably obtain a majority when submitted to popular vote, but this cannot be realized, and the reform must go on step by step as at present. The reform, therefore, seems likely slowly to advance. It can never be complete until the sovereign people forget that there is any other ground for appointment to clerical office, state, municipal, or national, save merit, ascertained by some impartial test."

MALLOCK ON LABOUCHERE.

W. H. Mallock, who apparently regards himself as the Great Heart who shall conduct tory pilgrims through their present difficulties, attacks in the Fortnightly Review for February Mr. Labouchere's recent article in the Forum on democracy in England. Mr. Mallock praises Mr. Labouchere's cleverness, assails the truth of his history and ridicules his conclusions. Mr. Mallock believes that the reform act of 1832 came, not from the growth of new ideas, but from the growth of new towns. He denies that the artisans of England are "frankly radical," and cites Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield and other great manufacturing towns, represented in parliament partly by tories or liberal unionists, in support of this denial. Then pretending to discover that when Mr. Labouchere says "the country" he means England, Mr. Mallock denies the assertion that the tories are a majority in the parliament and a minority in the country.

To Mr. Labouchere's assertion that the masses are the bone and sinew of the country while Lord Salisbury's subordinates are a contemptible set of men, who would not earn a living as commercial clerks, Mr. Mallock replies that Mr. Labouchere would find out of 1,000 men picked from his millions of artisans very few who could be trusted with the clerical work of a bank. He sneers at Mr. Labouchere's hope for unity of action among the masses, and says that they do not act together because they do not think together. Indeed, he suspects that many of them are natural conservatives.

Mr. Mallock admits that ideas have given conservatives trouble, but believes that the ideas of radicalism are gases generated in the section of the middle class that is both earnest and silly. Mr. Mallock is persuaded that Mr. Labouchere laughs in his sleeve at radicalism, and this leads him to the *argumentum ad hominem*. He tells the American public that he believes Mr. Labouchere to be a man to some extent ostracised by his own acts from the aristocratic class to which he belongs, and anxious alternately to annoy and terrify his late associates by exposing their foibles in his newspaper and threatening their privileges by coddling democracy. His real political position is that of "a political Puck, who has thrust on his shoulders the head of a political Caliban."

LEFT IT ALL BEHIND HIM.

St. Louis Republic.

John Jacob Astor died yesterday. He was once a very rich man.

HOW TO REACH THE FARMER.

CO-OPERATIVE PRINTS A MIGHTY ENGINE FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF THE SINGLE TAX.

There are in the United States and Canada a number of concerns that make it their exclusive business to furnish country publishers with sheets already printed on one side, containing general news, miscellaneous matter and a limited number of advertisements, but with the other side blank. The sheets are sent in this way week by week to the publishers ordering them, who in their own offices cause to be set up and printed the other side, called home side. In brief, the co-operative side is edited by the union, in its central office, and the home side by the editor or publisher of the paper in his office. The co-operative side is carefully compiled of the freshest and most interesting general matter, and presents many of the features of a large city weekly. According to the last volume of the American Newspaper Directory there are 16,310 different newspapers and magazines published in this country and Canada. Omitting the larger cities, the daily papers and monthlies, there remains not far from nine thousand publications that would be denominated "country weeklies." Over six thousand of these are now printed upon the co-operative plan—or more than one-half of the entire number.

The Memphis single tax association has made use of these co-operative or "patent insides" newspapers for the dissemination of the single tax among the farmers. The branch office of the A. N. Kellogg newspaper company at Memphis prints 208 newspapers. The following circular was sent to the editor of each paper:

PUBLICATION COMMITTEE OF
MEMPHIS SINGLE TAX ASSOCIATION,
59 MADISON STREET, MEMPHIS, TENN.,
Jan. 16, 1890.

Dear Sir: We have arranged with the branch office of the A. N. Kellogg newspaper company, which supplies your paper, to furnish two columns of single tax matter each week, free of cost, to all those papers on its list that are willing to receive them.

The Knights of Labor at their last general assembly, held in Atlanta, adopted the single tax as one of the principles of their order, and at different times farmers' organizations have adopted resolutions of similar import, complaining of the large amount of land held by syndicates and expressing dissatisfaction with the present system of taxation.

At the present moment it is especially proper that farmers should inform themselves in regard to the merits of the single tax question, owing to the fact that at no distant day they may be called upon through their organizations to pronounce upon a proposal of the Knights of Labor for united work along certain well-defined lines toward the amelioration of present conditions.

It would seem the duty of every paper relying upon farmers for its support, to lay before them the facts and arguments concerning this question. We hope you will take this view of the matter. If so, please sign and mail the inclosed postal card, and this matter will be furnished you free of cost. We inclose twelve columns of printed matter as a sample of what will be furnished should you accept this offer.

At all times we will be glad to have your opinion of the matter furnished and your suggestions as to how the service can be made more acceptable to your readers.

BOTTON SMITH, Chairman.

In each envelope there were inclosed samples of such matter as we intended to furnish, and a postal card addressed to the A. N. Kellogg newspaper company on the address side, while the other contained a request for the single tax matter. The editor wanting this matter had therefore only to sign the postal and mail it. Hardly were the circulars out before the postals began coming in every mail to the Kellogg office, and the manager has informed us that over forty of his papers are taking our matter. This result, within six weeks of the issuance of our circular, indicates a desire for fuller information in regard to the single tax greater than we had expected, and encouraged the association to make further efforts in the same direction. But before going on to tell of the further work, it may be of interest to the readers of THE STANDARD to explain how the matter was furnished. We furnish to the Kellogg office here the matter and pay the company two dollars a column for setting it up. Thus at an expense of four dollars a week forty papers receive two columns of our matter. Mr. H. O. Crane, manager of the Kansas City office of the Western newspaper union, expressed a willingness to receive and use papier mache matrices of the matter used by the Kelloggs, and circular similar to the one sent to the Kellogg papers, was at once sent to the Western newspaper union papers with equally satisfactory results. Thus do we supply almost an equal number of papers at a total additional cost of \$1, this being the cost of the matrices in four sizes as needed by the Western newspaper union and furnished by the Kelloggs here from the matter set up and used by them.

Under a similar arrangement with the head office of the Kellogg company at Chicago

similar circulars were sent out to 1,631 other papers of theirs issued from their head office and from their branches at St. Paul, St. Louis, Kansas City, Cincinnati and Cleveland. Although this circular has not been in the mails over ten days the demand for the matter is sufficient to induce the other Kellogg offices to ask for the matter. I will not know for some time just how many papers have asked for this matter, but if the demand for it should prove as great in the north as in the south (and one does not as a rule expect from the latter more advanced economic ideas than from the former) we will within a few weeks be furnishing 400 papers with two columns of single tax matter each week at a total cost of \$6 only, as the matrices for the other Kellogg offices are furnished by this office free of charge. It will be seen that the principal expense is the sending out of the circulars at first. We print the circular on a cyclostyle. The total expense is about three cents per name, including postals for answer and stamp. We have reached nearly one-third of the total number of "patent insides" in the country, and the remaining papers can be reached at a cost of \$125 more, if the other unions show the same liberal spirit as the Kellogg newspaper company has shown, and the Western newspaper union under the management of Mr. Crane. We have just had a request from the Omaha branch of the Western newspaper union—with 237 papers—to send circulars to its papers and supply them with the matter. This we will, of course, do. Our work in the past has naturally been in the cities, but from now on it would seem best to leave them to themselves. The farmer has not been touched. We must spare no time in reaching him, for until an impression is made on him no great paper will openly side with us, for fear of the cry, "You are trying to injure the farmer." But when any considerable body of farmers has pronounced for the single tax, this cry will no longer excite fear; there will be a short and easily comprehended answer.

The following is a list of the companies issuing ready-print, or patent outsides, together with the number of papers issued at each office. Any single tax association which desires to take up this work in its own district can obtain matrices in five sizes of the matter we have published by the Kellogg company by an expenditure of \$1.25 per week.

	Papers.
Aberdeen, Dak., Dakota newspaper union.....	65
New York Newspaper Union—	
Atlanta, Ga., Atlanta newspaper union.....	220
Baltimore Md., Baltimore newspaper union....	120
Birmingham, Ala., American newspaper union..	80
Boston, Mass., New England newspaper union..	120
Charlotte, N. C., Southern newspaper union....	60
New York, N. Y., New York newspaper union..	260
Pittsburg, Pa., Pittsburg newspaper union.....	160
A. N. Kellogg Newspaper Company—	
Chicago, Ill., Chicago newspaper company.....	366
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	207
Cleveland, Ohio.....	200
Kansas City, Kan.....	300
Memphis, Tenn.....	200
St. Louis, Mo.....	387
St. Paul, Minn.....	106
Chicago, Ill., Boyce's newspaper company.....	160
Chicago, Ill., Standard newspaper company.....	246
Western Newspaper Union—	
Dallas, Tex.....	182
Denver, Col.....	118
Des Moines, Iowa.....	129
Detroit, Mich.....	110
Kansas City, Kan.....	170
Lincoln, Neb.....	92
Omaha, Neb.....	240
St. Louis, Mo.....	101
Topeka, Kan.....	163
Indianapolis, Ind., Indianapolis newspaper union	143
Fort Wayne, Ind., Fort Wayne newspaper union	94
Madison, Wis., Wisconsin newspaper union....	83
Milwaukee, Wis., Milwaukee newspaper union....	88
New York, N. Y., Union printing company.....	140
Philadelphia, Pa., Central newspaper union....	150
San Francisco, Cal., San Francisco and North	
ern Pacific newspaper union.....	131
SioUX City, Iowa, Sioux City printing company.	176
SioUX City, Iowa, Sioux City newspaper union..	196
St. Paul, Minn., Northwestern newspaper union	266
Toronto, Ont., Auxiliary publishing company...	120

R. G. BROWN,

"FOR THE LAND IS MINE!"
From a sermon by Rev. Dr. Jewell of the M. E. church, San Jose, Cal.

This question of the proprietorship of land is a great one. It is rocking Ireland to day as on the upheaval of an earthquake. It has agitated the French people and God grant that it will not cause such a bloody conflict in this land. Now I tell you, God has never given His title to any man. It seems only right that He should be consulted when a change is made. Is not that just? I think it is. Another thing I want to emphasize is that a human being is above property. The veriest shoes on the meanest tramp is more in God's sight than all property. I do not tell you to-night that Henry George is the Moses to lead the American people from bondage. I have shown you what this chapter of Leviticus teaches. If I have taught what is not in the bible, do not accept it, but if it is there you are bound to receive it.

WHAT HAS MADE THIS CHANGE?

Boston Globe.

When the republican party came into power in 1860 the United States had under the flag over 5,500,000 tons of shipping, almost one-third of the tonnage of the world. Last year the world's tonnage was 91,045,704 tons, and out of this, 10,820,304 tons flew the flag of Great Britain.

THE FREE TRADE FIGHT.

FRANKLY SELFISH.

THE REFRESHING DEMAND OF A THREAD MANUFACTURER'S AGENT FOR FREE FLAX.

A correspondent sends to THE STANDARD a refreshingly impudent pamphlet on the tariff question by J. R. Leeson, selling agent for a firm of thread manufacturers of Massachusetts. Mr. Leeson, most of whose pamphlet appeared in the form of protectionist campaign matter in 1888, after urging the justice and necessity for protection to home industries, coolly argues in favor of free flax, which is the chief raw material used by his employers. The essence of protectionist selfishness is summed up in this paragraph from Mr. Leeson's free flax argument:

Probably our agricultural friends may be safely left to decide for themselves what crops it will best pay them to cultivate; they have shown their grasp of the situation, no less than the fertility of the land, by a gross annual product of their farms of two or three thousand millions of dollars' worth, leaving far behind every nation which gives statistics of its growth, and supplying us all with greater variety and abundance of food than was ever known in any country or any era.

The advocates of a duty upon flax fail to perceive the littleness of the interest under review. What is this demand, for the supply where farmers are advised to make such elaborate preparation? The value of flax imports may be taken as an approximate measure of actual consumption, home grown flax being of such insignificant amount as to be inappreciable. The farmer is asked to turn aside from the cultivation of hay, with an annual product of nearly three hundred million dollars; potatoes, exceeding fifty million dollars, or cotton, with three or four hundred million dollars' worth, in order that he may supply two million dollars' worth of flax!

It is hard to believe that Mr. Leeson could have read his own proofs, for surely the sight of this utterance in cold type must have suggested to him that the argument would not have seemed as plausible to the farmer as to the thread maker. Mr. Leeson is right; his agricultural friends may safely be left to decide for themselves what crops it will best pay them to cultivate; and he is equally right in his argument that farmers should not be induced by the unjust artifice of protection to enter upon the cultivation of any crop not naturally profitable. But what is sauce for the farmer goose is sauce for the manufacturing gander, and there is as little excuse for a tax in aid of thread manufacturers as there is for a like tax in aid of flax growers. Mr. Leeson's frank selfishness is highly instructive.

HIGHER RATES ON WOOL.

According to various Washington dispatches, the Ohio republicans in congress, as representing the clamorous wool growers of their state, have agreed upon the wool schedule of the proposed tariff bill. Stringent measures to prevent the introduction of clothing wools at the comparatively low rates imposed upon carpet wools will be suggested to the ways and means committee having the matter in charge. Class 1 (clothing wool), will be made dutiable at 11 cents per pound; class 2 (combing wool), 12 cents per pound; class 3 (carpet wool), under 15 cents per pound will be made dutiable at 2½ cents per pound, and over 15 cents dutiable at 8 cents per pound. The duty on classes 1 and 2 are the same as in the senate bill of last year. On class 3 the duty, under the senate bill, was 4 cents per pound on all wool costing less than 12 cents, and 8 cents per pound over that.

BRAVE WORDS FROM IOWA.

Governor Boies of Iowa said in his recent inaugural address:

If by reason of this tariff, which increases the cost of imported goods, home manufacturers are enabled to exact a like price for like products on which no duty is paid, it is plain we pay in the increased price of these goods not a tax for public use, but a contribution to the manufacturer, which he appropriates to his own use.

Any system of taxation the effect of which is to take from one class and give to another is necessarily a partial and unequal distribution of public burdens.

Such a tariff increases the cost of nearly everything we buy and diminishes the price of almost everything we sell. It obstructs our own ports against the importation of products we are compelled to use and foreign ports against those we produce and must send abroad.

We denounce as a conspiracy a combination between a few men to increase by artificial means the cost of the least of our necessities and encourage by national law a vast monopoly that defies the laws of trade and regulates in its own interest the price of nearly everything we are compelled to buy.

We have followed this delusion of a protective tariff with the blind faith of a devotee, listening to the most deceptive of arguments, believing in the most patent of fallacies.

Let it be understood that the people of this state demand cheap clothing, cheap fuel, cheap implements of labor—in short, cheap necessities. That they are not interested in cheap whisky or cheap tobacco, and that if compelled to take the latter cheap and the former dear they will surely resent the injury, and our labor will not be in vain.

BALLOT REFORM.

THE ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF BALLOT REFORM.

First—All ballots shall be official and shall be printed and distributed at public expense.

Second—The names of all candidates for the same office shall be printed on the same ballot.

Third—All ballots shall be delivered to the voter within the polling place on election day by sworn public officials.

Fourth—Only official ballots so delivered shall be voted. The voter shall be guaranteed absolute privacy in preparing his ballot, and the secrecy of the ballot made compulsory.

Fifth—Voters shall have the right to nominate candidates by properly certified petitions.

PRESENTING THE PETITION.

MR. SHEEHAN GETS IN THE WAY OF BALLOT REFORM AND IS NEARLY CARRIED OFF HIS FEET—A REMARKABLE SCENE IN THE ASSEMBLY.

The monster ballot reform petition bearing the signatures of 51,144 citizens of this city was presented in the assembly on Monday night. The book, eight feet thick, three feet long and two feet wide, containing the petition, was paraded up Broadway on Saturday and deposited in the large window of No. 240 Fifth avenue. On Sunday night it was suddenly decided to present the petition on Monday evening, and accordingly, on Monday morning the immense book, weighing 1,000 pounds, was taken to Albany.

The hand truck on which the book had been carried had broken down, so Oliver Sumner Teall, who had charge of the enrollment, engaged a special baggage car for the trip to Albany and took along a carpenter to make repairs en route. He also took along his force of clerks to give the final touch to the enrollment and weed out any duplicates that might have escaped the careful sifting to which the signatures had already been subjected.

It was generally known that the petition would be presented at the Monday night session of the assembly, and accordingly there was a full house and a crush in the galleries. General Husted was asked to present the petition, and while he was about it Mr. Fish occupied the chair. General Husted asked unanimous consent for the introduction of the petition, but "Drydollar" Sullivan and Governor Hill's friend, Mr. Sheehan, objected. General Husted then moved that in view of the objections, the petition be deposited in the center of the "well," which would bring it in full view of the house, galleries, reporters and officers. Mr. Sheehan screamed that General Husted was interrupting him and out of order, but Mr. Fish smilingly assured the governor's enraged friend that General Husted had been too quick for him and had obtained recognition. Mr. Sheehan insisted that the petition could not be received until after adjournment, and then could be presented only to the clerk. He was overruled by the acting speaker.

The house was now on its feet, the galleries were humming, and the scene was altogether such as the assembly never before presented. This was General Husted's opportunity, and at a signal from him the stout men who bore the great book on its oaken truck advanced to the main aisle. Mr. Sheehan stood midway the aisle protesting, and the moving procession bore down on him. The advance was irresistible and the angry objector was carried forward twenty feet down the aisle and almost against the desks of the reporters. The truck with its great volume was set down in the middle of the well, and the house and galleries broke into cheers, the democrats hissing.

Mr. Sheehan vainly protested that he had been violently prevented from speaking. He rose to a question of privilege and declared that he had a right to stand on the floor. General Husted, who by this time had taken the chair, declared that the petition had only been introduced, not presented, and as to Mr. Sheehan's question of privilege ruled that he had no right to obstruct the aisle. Mr. Sheehan declared that the petition had no more force than if signed by five citizens, and continued to protest in vain against the manner of its introduction.

The presentation of the petition made a tremendous sensation and was the talk of the house for hours. Mr. Teall was accompanied by many members of the ballot reform league, and all testify that Mr. Sheehan's objection was the best thing that could have possibly happened. All the New York morning papers gave from a column to a column and a half to the scene. Here are some of their head lines:

Omens Favor Ballot Reform. Hill's Henchman, Sheehan, While Objecting to Presentation of the Petition in the Assembly, Is Knocked Out by the Bulky Volume. Its Resistless March. Borne on the Shoulders of Fourteen Men the Monster Book Passes Down the Aisle, Pushing the Democratic Leader to the Well. Evils of a Bad Temper. Speaker Husted, Placid and Bland, Jokes with the Eager Opponent of the Saxton Bill.—Herald.

The Big Book in Albany. The Monster Petition for Ballot Reform. It Creates a Sensation in the Assembly and Makes Governor Hill's Spokesman Lose His Temper.—Times.

Mr. Sheehan in Wrath. Vainly Trying to Obstruct the Ballot Reform Petition in the

Assembly. Roaring Out a Threat Against the Speaker, Who Silences Him. The Monster Petition Officially Recognized by the Assembly. A Description of It.—[Tribune.]

Half a Ton of Petition. The Ponderous Document Sent in by the Ballot Reformers. Despite Democratic Protest it is Deposited in the Assembly by Twelve Stalwart Men. A Lively Scene.—[Press.]

A BIT OF ANALYSIS.

To the Editor of The Standard—Sir: Now that the work of canvassing on the ballot reform petition is over and done with, it may be instructive to give a little analysis of how the signatures were got in the Nineteenth assembly district (by way of convincing some of our hidebound democratic friends that this movement is not a republican trick and device), particularly if other districts will report in the same manner. We called for help in the Nineteenth upon men of every shade of political faith, and every single tax man who was asked to work at least promised to, and very few failed to in some measure make good their promise. But from each of the other organizations that we were able to address only about one fourth even responded, and half of these did nothing. Owing to the scattering way that signatures came in only 2,875 out of the 4,326 total who signed from the district could be properly credited to those who had collected them; but one-third of these were taken by single tax men, who in but few instances had money to spend on the work, 823 coming through "unlimited" single taxers, and 184 from the "limited" species. Republicans showed results in but seven election districts, which contributed 704 names, including 99 gathered by an old united labor party worker, while straight-cut democrats turned in 250 and mugwumps 820, the bulk of which last were got by one man; 94 names were collected by workers whose politics were unknown. The honor roll individually is headed by a member of the reform club, Nathan Clark, Jr., who ranks himself as a mugwump, but has been a free trader far long enough to be fairly over the fence. He gave both time and money so liberally to the work that his record was 512. Julius Schlueter, a single tax standby, coming next in point of results as compared with opportunities, by securing 170 signatures through personal effort in a district where only 161 votes were cast a year ago. Of course, a number of considerations have to be allowed for in judging the true results of work done in different districts, and making these allowances, the champion workers are placed in further order as follows: George E. Francis, limited single tax, with 131; H. Kunhardt, Jr., republican, with 127; Frank H. Platt and Percival Knauth, republicans, with 215 in a much larger district; George Hawkins, single tax, with 72 under peculiar disadvantages; Patrick Fee, single tax, with 136 in a Tammany district; John De Witt Warner, democrat, with 116; N. M. Watson, republican, with 137, and Benjamin Van Veen, single tax, with R. T. B. Easton, republican, who had 125, working together.

E. J. SHRIVER.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SAXTON BILL.

At a hearing before the assembly judiciary committee many amendments to the Saxton bill were presented, among them those of Lieutenant-Governor Jones, already noted in THE STANDARD. Ex-Corporation Counsel Beekman of New York proclaimed himself a ballot reformer, but insisted that the bill should be materially amended, though he would cheerfully bow to the will of the committee.

Section 4, which provides that certificates relating to offices to be filled by the voters of any district greater than a county must be filed with the secretary of state, and all other certificates with the clerks of the counties wherein the officers are to be elected. Mr. Beekman wished to amend as follows: "The certificate of nomination for senator for the Fifth senate district shall be filed in the office of the clerk of the city and county of New York and a copy thereof, certified by such clerk, shall be filed in the office of the county clerk of Richmond county." This, he argued, would put the Fifth district, which comprises Richmond county and the lower part of New York city, on a footing with the other city senatorial districts. Section 4 he wished further to amend in this manner: "When the election is for an office to be filled by the voters of the city and county of New York, the number of signatures so required shall not be less than 500, and when the election is for an office to be filled wholly or in part by the voters of any portion of said city and county less than the whole, such number shall not be less than 150."

He proposed to amend section 17 so that it shall read thus:

The general ballots shall not contain the names of candidates for municipal offices, but each municipal ballot shall contain the names of all such candidates whose nominations for any municipal office shall have been certified (and not withdrawn) as herein provided, and no other names shall appear on the ballots except that in the city and county of New York each municipal ballot shall also contain the names of all other candidates whose nominations shall have been duly certified and not withdrawn for public offices to be filled exclusively by the voters of the

said city and county, or of any district within the same, other than candidates for member of congress, state senator, and member of the assembly.

For the purpose of permitting voters to paste the names of candidates on any official ballot this further amendment to section 17 was submitted:

The last column shall be left blank in order that the voter may have sufficient space opposite the title of each office to write or paste in the names of any persons not mentioned in the ballot for whom he may wish to vote; but this provision shall not be construed as forbidding the voter from writing or pasting in such names in any column.

Mr. Beekman suggested other amendments, and Mr. Saxton said that some of them seemed good, though he would like an opportunity to examine them.

Senator Linson, Fassett, Hendricks, Chase and Saxton have agreed upon a registration bill for the whole state. It provides for personal annual registration, with four days in which to register, in every city in the state, and it applies to all towns and villages the same system of registration as is now in vogue in cities of over 16,000 inhabitants, which provides for compulsory registration, not personal, except on the last day.

BROOKLYN DEMOCRATS FAVORABLE.

At a largely attended meeting of the Brooklyn young men's democratic club on Monday evening, resolutions in favor of ballot reform, which had been drawn up by the executive committee, were unanimously adopted. In these resolutions the club declared itself in favor of a general registration of citizens, and of having the various proposed features of electoral reform embraced in one comprehensive bill, although, if this could not be done, it declared in favor of getting whatever part of the reform was possible. The resolutions strongly advocated the exclusively official ballot and urged Governor Hill to not veto a bill on account of constitutional scruples on this point, but to leave the question of constitutionality to the courts.

Robert Baker, a single taxer, connected with THE STANDARD, who had obtained 800 signatures to the ballot reform petition, warmly denounced Governor Hill as no democrat, and received a hearty round of applause.

A BILL IN NEW JERSEY.

SALIENT FEATURES OF THE MEASURE PREPARED BY SENATOR WERTS.

Senator Werts, democrat, who was instructed by the New Jersey legislature's joint ballot reform committee to prepare a ballot reform measure, has reported to the committee a bill covering sixty pages of type-written foolscap. This bill is not expected to pass in the shape that it now appears in. It contemplates general registration, nomination by petition and an exclusively official ballot. The ballots are to be distributed from the secretary of state's office to the county clerks, and through them sent to the polling places in pads of fifty each, sealed. The election officers are to receive them, and the seal is to be broken when proclamation is made of the opening of the polls. But any citizen may send to the clerk for ballots ten days before election, and he can be served with a number less than fifty, and the ballots thus secured can be voted. On the ballots the candidates of each party for all the offices to be filled are to be grouped, with the device of the party over the names.

It shall be the duties of the clerks of municipalities and townships to secure, thirty days before any election, suitable rooms in which to hold the election. These compartments shall have swinging doors, and shall be otherwise arranged according to the Australian plan. There shall be one booth, at least, for every seventy-five voters, and not less than five booths at each polling place. Only one person shall be permitted in a booth at a time. The booths shall be within railied inclosures, in which the ballot boxes are also to be kept. Agents of candidates will be permitted within the rails. The voter shall prepare his ballot, and may not remain in the booth over five minutes. He shall fold the face of the ballot in, and the election officer shall not look at the face of it. He shall punch a hole at the head of the group of the candidates for whom he desires to vote. He may put dashes over the names that he does not desire to vote. The punches shall be of metal, each district having a different punch. Blind or disabled persons may take a friend within the booth to assist them.

There are ample provisions for punishing bribery and intimidation.

Henry C. Gruber, an active ballot reformer, opposes the provision permitting the official ballot to be distributed ten days before election. It is said that the Hudson county ballot reform league will oppose objectionable features of the bill.

HUMBUG IN MARYLAND.

THE DEMOCRATIC MACHINE TRYING TO PASS A MUTILATED MEASURE.

Maryland's ballot reform bill seems to be almost guiltless of reform and Senator John P. Poe, democrat, who professed an interest in true reform, is held responsible for the

unsatisfactory measure now reported from the senate committee.

Instead of one official ballot bearing the name of all the party candidates, as the business men's bill proposes, there are to be three official ballots, and in addition the envelope system is to be adopted and provision made that a foreigner who has not a sufficient comprehension of the English language can take an interpreter in with him. The ballots are to be printed by the board of election supervisors for the three parties, each with an appropriate emblem or device at the top. They are to be sent to the board of police commissioners in sealed packages, who shall in turn send them to the judges of election, and they shall give them to the ballot wardens at the various polling places. The voter can only get his ticket on the inside, but may take it with him an unofficial ticket printed on colored paper or with marks across the back as a guide. When the clerk has ascertained that he is a properly qualified voter and the three tickets are placed in his hands, together with an envelop, he goes into the booth to prepare his ballot. Each ticket must be printed "official ballot." He selects the one he wants to vote, puts it into the envelope and seals it. The ballot warden endorses his initials across the back and the voter deposits his ticket with the judges. The other two are required to drop into the refuse ballot box, and all these tickets are afterward counted as a check. The penalty for taking any ballot from the room instead of dropping it into this box is \$50 fine or six months' imprisonment.

The plan of having three ballots allows the voter to practice the Tasmanian dodge, by which he can put a blank piece of paper or anything he pleases in the envelope, put the official ballot in his pocket and give it to a man on the outside, who can fix it as he chooses, vote it and take out another ballot to his friend, who can in turn vote it. Thus by the first voter throwing his own vote away hundreds of others can be kept going. Then again bribery and intimidation are possible by using the separate ballot. There is a punishment awaiting the voter who takes a ballot from the room. It may be inflicted, if the offender is discovered, but as the refuse box is not opened until after the polls are closed, it will not be possible to bring the offender to book.

All the Baltimore newspapers denounce the measure and the Ballot reform league is disgusted with the guise in which its bill comes from the committee. Many democrats will refuse to support the measure although the machine is trying hard to force it through the caucus. Republicans denounce the accompanying registration measure.

SYSTEMATIC WORK IN OREGON.

Oregon has a ballot reform league which hopes to bring about the adoption of the Australian system at the session of the legislature beginning next January. The league has its central organization in Portland, and its president is George E. Witlington of the First national bank. The league will seek to spread branch organizations throughout the state. The league has prepared for signature a pledge that the voter signing will vote for only such candidates for the legislature as promise to do all in their power to bring about the adoption of the Australian system. Signatures are coming in rapidly and the labor organizations, grangers and business men are friendly to the movement. It is expected that 20,000 pledges will be obtained. These pledges will be submitted to all legislative candidates, and the question will be asked will you aid this movement if elected to the legislature? The replies of all candidates will be sent to signers of the pledge. The legislature will be elected in June. R. H. Thompson, a large real estate owner of Portland and an earnest single tax man, says that the bill to be drafted by the league will become a law at the next session of the legislature.

NORTH DAKOTA WILL HAVE THE REFORM.

A. S. Froslid of Hatton, N. Dak., writes to THE STANDARD, under date of February 21, saying that the Australian ballot bill which has passed the senate, despite the fact that the regular committee, to which it was referred, reported adversely on the bill, will in all probability pass the lower house and become a law. At the last session of the territorial legislature a similar bill passed both houses by a large majority, but it was stolen before it was presented to the governor for signature.

"Ballot Reform," an address delivered by George A. Miller in November last before the Tariff reform club of Montclair, N. J., has been issued in a neat pamphlet.

The republican majority in the West Virginia senate has defeated the ballot reform bill and the legislature has adjourned.

MR. SHEARMAN AT ITHACA.

Thomas G. Shearman made a free trade speech at Ithaca on Washington's birthday, under the auspices of the Cornell university mock congress. His address excited deep interest in the audience and stirred up an earnest newspaper controversy. Many professors and students of Cornell attended the meeting, and the introductory speech was made by Professor Charles A. Collins, of the school of law. Professor Thompson, a professional protectionist of the University of Pennsylvania, will reply to Mr. Shearman next month.

SINGLE TAX NEWS.

SINGLE TAX PLATFORM.

The single tax contemplates the abolition of all taxes upon labor or the products of labor—that is to say, the abolition of all taxes save one tax levied on the value of land, irrespective of improvements.

Since in all our states we now levy some tax on the value of land, the single tax can be instituted by the simple and easy way abolishing, one after another, all other taxes now levied, and commensurately increasing the tax on land values, until we draw upon that one source for all expenses of government; the revenue being divided between local governments, state governments and the general government, as the revenue from direct taxes is now divided between the local and state governments, or a direct assessment being made by the general government upon the states and paid by them from revenues collected in this manner.

The single tax is not a tax on land, and therefore would not fall on the use of land and become a tax on labor.

It is a tax, not on land, but on the value of land. Thus it would not fall on all land, but only on valuable land, and on that not in proportion to the use made of it, but in proportion to its value—the premium which the user of land must pay to the owner, either in purchase money or in rent, for permission to use valuable land. It would thus be a tax, not on the use or improvement of land, but on the ownership of land, taking what would otherwise go to the owner as owner, and not as user.

In assessments under the single tax all values created by individual use or improvement would be excluded, and the only value taken into consideration would be the value attaching to the bare land by reason of neighborhood, etc. Thus the farmer would have no more taxes to pay than the speculator who held a similar piece of land idle, and the man who on a city lot erected a valuable building would be taxed no more than the man who held a similar lot vacant.

The single tax, in short, would call upon men to contribute to the public revenues not in proportion to what they produce or accumulate, but in proportion to the value of the natural opportunities they hold. It would compel them to pay just as much for holding land idle as for putting it to its fullest use.

The single tax, therefore, would—

1. Take the weight of taxation off of the agricultural districts where land has little or no value irrespective of improvements, and put it on towns and cities where bare land rises to a value of millions of dollars per acre.

2. Dispense with a multiplicity of taxes and a horde of taxgatherers, simplify government and greatly reduce its cost.

3. Do away with the fraud, corruption and gross inequality inseparable from our present methods of taxation, which allow the rich to escape while they grind the poor. Land cannot be bid or carried off, and its value can be ascertained with greater ease and certainty than any other.

4. Give us with all the world as perfect freedom of trade as now exists between the states of our Union, thus enabling our people to share through free exchanges in all the advantages which nature has given to other countries, or which the peculiar skill of other peoples has enabled them to attain. It would destroy the trusts, monopolies, and corruptions which are the outgrowths of the tariff. It would do away with the fines and penalties now levied on any one who improves a farm, erects a house, builds a machine, or in any way adds to the general stock of wealth. It would leave every one free to apply labor or expend capital in production or exchange without fine or restriction, and would leave to each the full product of his exertion.

5. It would, on the other hand, by taking for public uses that value which attaches to land by reason of the growth and improvement of the community, make the holding of land unprofitable to the mere owner and profitable only to the user. It would thus make it impossible for speculators and monopolists to hold natural opportunities unused or only half used, and would throw open to labor the illimitable field of employment which the earth offers to man. It would thus solve the labor problem, do away with involuntary poverty, raise wages in all occupations to the full earnings of labor, make overproduction impossible until all human wants are satisfied, render labor saving inventions a blessing to all, and cause such an enormous production and such an equitable distribution of wealth as would give to all comfort, leisure and participation in the advantages of an advancing civilization.

The ethical principles on which the single tax is based are:

1. Each man is entitled to all that his labor produces. Therefore no tax should be levied on the products of labor.

2. All men are equally entitled to what God has created and to what is gained by the general growth and improvement of the community of which they are a part. Therefore, no one should be permitted to hold natural opportunities without a fair return to all for any special privilege thus accorded to him, and that value which the growth and improvement of the community attaches to land should be taken for the use of the community.

LETTING IN LIGHT.

THE SINGLE TAX MEN OF PHILADELPHIA HAVE A TILT WITH AN OFFICIAL COMMITTEE ON TAXATION.

Philadelphia, March 1.—Single tax men made a hit in the hearing this week before the state commission appointed to investigate the question of taxation. A. H. Stephenson and J. L. Shoemaker represented the Henry George club, and the latter distributed to the members of the commission and others present copies of a proposed law providing for a separate assessment of land and improvements, and empowering local taxing bodies to exempt from taxation all buildings, structures, living trees, developments of mines, personal property and all products of labor, all salaries, profits of professions, trades and occupations, money at interest, stocks, bonds and loans.

Mr. Stephenson then had a hearing before the commission. He presented sound single tax arguments against various other taxes; declared that in Philadelphia workingmen's houses were assessed at 70 to 80 per cent of their value, and the real estate of large holders at a much lower percentage.

"Would it not be so under your system?" asked Chairman McCamant.

"No. Two men own lots equal in size, side by side, on Broad street. The man who has a \$100,000 house on his is to be taxed on the land value alone and the same amount as the other man, who has nothing on his lot. Their lots are necessarily approximately equal in value, and neither can be discriminated against without his finding it out."

"Isn't the present inequalities due to the bad judgment of assessors?" was asked.

"They are universal, and yet there must be some good assessors," was the reply.

"Of course, gentlemen, this single tax principle is going to utterly destroy land speculation."

"Yes."

"You'll destroy ownership?" was suggested.

"Yes, speculative ownership. Possession will be more secure than ever. One tax will make taxation equal. Now a man can buy a lot, go to Europe for ten years, return and find his lot doubled in value. We destroy his ownership of that unearned increment. We propose to tax only those values which the city, the presence of the people creates, and let a man improve his place as rapidly as possible without fining him for it. We propose to take the unearned increment for the use of the people who created it."

"Suppose a man's property falls in value," suggested Mr. Wright.

"Then we tax him less."

"Shouldn't we give the unearned increment back to him?"

"Yes, we do. We tax him less. Big taxes will fall upon the big values and low taxes on the low land values. The city will pay more. The farmer will pay less. The value of land is mainly due to the improvements on it, and when we exempt his improvements there will be less to tax the farmer on."

"Doesn't the building give the value to the land?" asked Mr. McCamant. "How could you separate the value of the building of the Girard trust from that of the land it stands on?"

Before a reply could be made Representative Taggart hastily added to it the supposition that if the houses were cleared off from Broad street to the Delaware, what would the land be worth?

"Without the people?" retorted Mr. Stephenson.

"The people wouldn't be there without the houses," snapped Mr. Taggart.

"The houses wouldn't be there without the people," replied Mr. Stephenson, and he enlarged upon the doctrine that the presence of the people was what created the land value, and that the only thing that made Chestnut street houses more valuable than those on Poplar street was the "crop of people" that were passing along.

Editor George E. Mapes, a speculator, asked if the single tax system would not drive wealth into bonds and other forms of property, so that the tax would be uncollectable.

"We won't drive any wealth out of the country," responded Mr. Stephenson, "and bonds only represent improvements."

"Suppose there are two farms," said Mr. Wherry; "on one the improvements are seventy-five per cent of its market value; on the other twenty-five per cent. The market value of one is \$100 per acre; of the other \$80 per acre. How will you get the land values?"

"Subtract the value of the improvements from the market value," replied Mr. Stephenson. "The farm of \$100 per acre with seventy-five per cent of improvements would be taxed on a land value of \$25, and the farm of \$80 per acre, with twenty-five per cent of improvements would be taxed on a land value of \$20."

"Then," said Mr. Wherry, "there are many farms in Pennsylvania where there are \$10,000 worth of improvements on \$5,000 worth of land, say."

"Then they would pay no tax," said the witness.

Mr. Wherry said that about a quarter of the farms in Pennsylvania would be found so.

"Then wouldn't your tax mean confiscation?" asked Mr. McCamant.

"I am not terrified by that word, gentlemen," was the smiling reply. "I have heard it before. If so, there would be a different

confiscator. The confiscator would not be the land speculator."

"Would not a man be entitled to a bonus for increasing the value of the surrounding property by his own improvements?" asked Mr. Wherry.

"No. He improves it to a certain extent, but the people who go down Chestnut street are those who make the property valuable," was the rejoinder.

Then Mr. Stephenson said that the assessed value of Philadelphia was about \$600,000,000. As it was usually assessed at sixty per cent of its value, its real value was about \$1,000,000,000. Subtract half as due to improvements and tax the other half as land value four per cent and the city would get about \$20,000,000 revenue as against \$19,000,000 spent by the city in 1889.

T. L. Shoemaker added that by a calculation based upon our 700 miles of paved streets and 800 miles of unpaved streets he estimated a land value of \$700,000,000, which, at three per cent, would give a city revenue of \$21,000,000 a year. "You must adopt this single system," he said, with earnestness, "or continue to flue men for telling the truth or fine them for their industry."

FROM THE UPPER LEHIGH.

AN ABSOLUTE FREE TRADE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY A DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, AND A SINGLE TAX MAN ELECTED ASSESSOR.

Freeland, Pa.—The fact that we have yet failed to organize single tax clubs in the coal regions would seem to indicate that our cause is not progressing as well as might be expected; but such is not the case. It is true that we have many men who take pride in saying that they are single tax men, but the fact remains that the number of real single tax men is very limited. It is our opinion that more good can be done here by indirect methods. If we isolate ourselves from existing political organizations we array against us the very men whom we expect to convert and whose aid and co-operation is necessary. That the position we have taken is the correct one is proven by the results of the late township election. The single tax men joined with the democrats, and three of them were members of the convention. Now see the planks they got into the platform, which was unanimously agreed to:

Resolved, That the tariff, as a protecting medium, is a delusion and a fraud—that it restricts industry, hampers trade and makes possible the various trusts and combines that speculate in the necessities of life. That indirect and unjust methods of taxation has reduced the wealth producers to the position of dependent mendicants, begging for permission to live and toil. We believe that industrial emancipation demands that trade between this grand republic and the nations of the earth should be as free as trade between Foster township and Freeland borough.

We are a community of wealth-producers, clothed with absolute power in the management of our local affairs; yet, despite the fact of the enormous increase in population and wealth of our township, the basis of our taxable valuation appears to remain stationary. The poor man is taxed to the limit of the law for being industrious and thrifty, while his children are deprived of the benefits of a common school education.

Now, these resolutions are not what they might be, but all candid men will admit that they are an improvement on what the democrats have been in the habit of giving us. Our township (Foster) has heretofore had a republican majority of fifty; but this time, despite our absolute free trade resolution, the vote split up, giving victory to about half the democratic ticket. The democratic candidate for assessor led all the candidates, getting seventy-five majority. His name is George McGee, the most outspoken single tax man in this region. Just watch and see if he does not do his duty by the people here in the matter of taxation.

CASES IN POINT.

MILWAUKEE, Feb. 26.—Milwaukee is a young city, but that it can give a pointer to the single tax advocates will be seen by the following facts: There is on Grand avenue, our prominent thoroughfare, and in the very heart of the city, a number of low wooden buildings, standing among five large business blocks. An enterprising citizen desires to erect in place of these shanties a seven story building. He has secured titles to all the lots except one, paying for them the high prices demanded in consideration of their location and increased value through the enterprise of neighboring owners. This one lot is twenty feet front, and its assessed valuation is \$14,000, and the building upon it is assessed \$700. The price offered is \$30,000, but the owner first stood out for \$15,000, which is now increased to \$30,000. Thirty thousand dollars is considered a fancy price.

Oconomowee, a popular summer resort of Wisconsin, visited by people from all parts of the United States, has a rickety old depot, one of the first built by the first railroad built in the state. A piece of ground seventy by one hundred and thirty feet is needed to carry out the plan of parking the depot site and making it an ornament to the beautiful little town. The lot, from its peculiar location, is not suitable for any other purpose than that for which the railroad will use it, but the owner, taking advantage of the road's needs, demands a price for it that the management deemed exorbitant, and he refused

may defeat the entire park project and deprive the town of an attractive improvement.

AMELIA M. BATE.

THE PETITION.

SINGLE TAX ENROLMENT COMMITTEE,
36 CLINTON PLACE,
NEW YORK, March 4, 1890.

The single tax enrolment committee is circulating a petition asking the United States house of representatives to appoint a special committee to make inquiry into and report upon the expediency of raising all public revenues by a single tax upon the value of land, irrespective of improvements, to the exclusion of all other taxes, whether in the form of tariffs upon imports, taxes upon internal productions or otherwise. It will send blank petitions on application to any address, and single tax men are urged to obtain petitions and obtain signatures as a most convenient and effective way of starting the discussion of our principles.

The response to our circular letter of February 22 has been extremely gratifying, as our subscription and contribution lists show. The calls on the committee for literature are steadily growing heavier, but what with the pledges thus far received and the promise of aid soon from many of our "workers," we feel confident that we shall be able to meet all reasonable demands.

Subscriptions toward the expenses of this committee's work for the week ending March 4, are as follows:

Wm. B. Vernam, Brooklyn N. Y.	\$ 8 00
C. H. Baildon, Marlborough, N. Y.	1 20
Jas. K. McGuire, Syracuse, N. Y.	25 00
C. P. Bolin, Whitman, Mass.	6 00
Herman Benz, New York city	6 00
Through Chas. Fischer, New York city	
"Ilion," Ilion, N. Y.	75
Wm. O. Foley, Greensburg, Ind.	16 50
Jas. R. Carter (add.), Boston, Mass.	4 00
Through O. Savard, St. Paul, Minn.	20 00
Through Geo. Eggleston, New York city	2 40
"Single Tax," Massachusetts	9 60
Through M. V. Watros, Marshalltown, Iowa	1 00
Chas. S. Prizer, Reading, Pa.	7 00
W. N. Ferguson, Boston, Mass.	6 00
	2 40
	\$110 85

Subscriptions previously acknowledged in THE STANDARD \$2,742 70

Total \$2,853 55

Cash contributions for the week are as follows:

Edward Burgess, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	\$ 5 00
Wm. M. Biell, Baird, Texas	50
J. C. Barues, M. D., Hindsboro, Ill.	1 00
Anthony Schram, Buffalo, N. Y.	25
L. M. Clark, New York city	10 00
Thomas Douglas, Whitman, Mass.	1 04
Thomas Hunt, Kennedy, Ohio	1 00
M. Marr, Nashville, Tenn.	1 00
S. D. Conklin, Cleveland, Ohio	50
James B. Jones, Philadelphia, Pa.	50
F. P. MacKeelean, Chicago, Ill.	2 00
F. M. Titus, New York city	1 00
Miss M. A. Crane, Brooklyn, N. Y.	2 00
William R. Boyd, Atlanta, Ga.	38
K. P. Alexander, Newburg, Mo.	3 50
Fred. McLutosh, Kansas City, Mo.	
Woodford Shannon, Medicine Lodge, Kan.	50
Edwin Platt, Irving, Ill.	1 25
C. A. Duele, Marshalltown, Iowa	25
Charles S. Prizer, Reading, Pa.	64
H. L. Bachman, S. Bethlehem, Pa.	1 00
V. E. Harvey, Middletown, N. Y.	1 00
John Mulrooney, Plymouth, Mass.	1 00
	\$40 81

Contributions previously acknowledged 507 19

Total \$548 00

The enrolment now stands as follows:

Reported last week 75,508

Received during the week ending

March 4 541

Total 76,139

G. ST. J. LEAVENS, Sec.

NEW YORK CITY ASSESSMENTS.

IMPROVED.

No. 354 East Fiftieth street, four story front dwelling. Sold for \$15,000; assessed at \$7,000, or 46½ per cent of its value.

No. 18 East Fifty-eighth street, four story stone front dwelling. Sold for \$40,000; assessed at \$21,000, or 52½ per cent of its value.

No. 428 East Seventy-third street, five story brick tenement, with stores. Sold for \$23,000; assessed at \$11,000, or 46½ per cent of its value.

No. 227 East Seventy-ninth street, four story stone front flat. Sold for \$42,500; assessed at \$12,000, or 27½ per cent of its value.

No. 77 East 11th street, three story stone front dwelling. Sold for \$10,000; assessed at \$4,500, or 45 per cent of its value.

No. 244 West 130th street, three story brick dwelling. Sold for \$13,750; assessed at \$8,000, or 58½ per cent of its value.

The average assessment on the above six buildings is 46 per cent of value.

UNIMPROVED.

South side Fifty-ninth street, 25 feet west of Sixth avenue, 46x100.5. Sold for \$50,000; assessed at \$30,000, or 60 per cent of its value.

South side Eighty-seventh street, 400 feet west of West End avenue, 100x100.8. Sold for \$43,200; assessed at \$18,000, or 41½ per cent of its value.

South side Ninety-third street, 105 feet east of Park avenue, 46x100.8. Sold for

\$17,000; assessed at \$6,500, or 28½ per cent of its value.

North side Ninety-third street, 330 feet west of Fourth avenue, 70x100.8. Sold for \$40,000; assessed at \$13,500, or 33½ per cent of its value.

North side 122d street, 310 feet west of Third avenue, 25x100. Sold for \$6,500; assessed at \$3,200, or 49 per cent of its value.

The average assessment on the above six parcels of land is 42½ per cent of value.

THE ROLL OF STATES.

NEW YORK CITY.

A PLEASURABLE EVENING—IMPORTANT BUSINESS AT THE MONTHLY MEETING, TO BE HELD TO-MORROW EVENING.

Last Thursday evening the members of the Manhattan single tax club and their friends gathered together for social purposes. The programme called it a "smoke talk," but it proved to be one of the most pleasant episodes in the history of the club. The agitation committee had procured the services of Signor Carlo Brizzi as pianist, but they were not prepared for the masterly renditions he gave; therefore their delight was beyond bounds.

In opening the signor gave selections from "Faust," "Trovatore" and "Hernani" which roused the lovers of grand opera present to enthusiasm, and later he rendered, complete, the overture to "Il Barbiere di Siviglia." William McCabe, the "talker" for the occasion, told a couple of stories about Mark Twain when he was a resident of Virginia City, Nevada, and read "The Mormon's Story," which appeared in THE STANDARD about two years ago.

A. J. Steers, Wm. Mulligan, W. H. Faulhaber, George Brunswick, George Simon, Morris Van Veen and Mr. Gariepy rendered solos, duets, quintets and choruses, which, being embellished by the piano accompaniment of Signor Brizzi, afforded great pleasure to those present. To vary the proceedings, the "talker" asked Messrs. Wolf and Steers to tell how they became single tax men. Space will not allow to give their stories as they were told; and it will be sufficient to say that at the foundation was a strong religious feeling. Mr. Steers became a single tax man because he was a strict Catholic, and Mr. Wolf became one because he was an orthodox Jew; thus, commencing from opposite religious extremes, they had reasoned their way to the common ground on which they both could stand—become co-religionists.

The proceedings were a succession of delightful episodes and melody, and eleven o'clock came before those present thought of looking at the clock; but with the rising of the sun men must go to work, so, regrettably, the "smoke talk" closed by the singing of "Auld Lang Syne," and the members went off in groups to their homes to rest and prepare for the coming day's toil. It was a delightful evening.

At its last meeting the managing board appointed Dr. Walter Mendelson and E. J. Shriver a committee to arrange, with the West side republican club, a debate on the single tax.

The board also decided to drop from the roll all the members who were in arrears on February 1; also, that the club would remit all arreages to such members as under the new constitution paid their dues for the months of February and March, to be paid not later than March 10. Under this action all members who have permitted themselves to run behind in the past, and who may desire to renew their fellowship, can do so by paying one dollar for the month just passed and one dollar for the present month. The board hopes that all the members who have fallen back will straighten themselves on the books of the club. The club will move into larger quarters in May, and active work will soon begin.

To-morrow evening (Thursday, March 6), will be the regular monthly meeting of the club. All the members are asked to be present, because the "neighborhood committee" will report, and the club will be divided into sub-committees to call on all the single tax men in this city to secure their active co-operation in the work contemplated in the direction of the single tax.

Thomas F. Foy, Annexed District.—The sad news came to us at our last meeting that Isaac Pendorf, an esteemed member of our club, had died. On motion resolutions of sorrow were adopted and copies sent to THE STANDARD and to the family of the deceased, after which the club adjourned.

BROOKLYN.

THE MEETING AT FLATBUSH—SINGLE TAX AMONG THE SWEDENBORGIAN.

The members of the club and their friends were present in force Wednesday evening, February 26, to listen to singing, recitations, etc. Among those who assisted in making the evening enjoyable were the Misses Whitehead, F. J. Deverall and lady, Mr. Fitzgerald, the baritone of the Church of the Angels, the Windsor cornet band and W. L. Thompson. F. E. A. Curley recited in admirable style, and the Messrs. Beggs both sang a solo, and President Aitken explained the genesis of the single tax.

Mr. G. W. Thompson lectured before the club Sunday evening on "The Path of Liberty."

The meeting at Flatbush, Saturday evening, March 1, at the town hall, was a success. Supervisor Lyman, in calling it to order, announced that its object was to protest against the passage, in its present form, of a measure before the legislature proposing to annex Flatbush to Brooklyn. While disclaiming any knowledge of the single tax, he wished to tell those present that the single tax club of Brooklyn was working for what they regarded as the interests of the whole people, especially of the workingman. The editor of the Kings County Gazette, Mr. E. H. Roberts, who presided, said that if the single tax would remedy existing unjust assessments and unjust tax laws he would be heartily in favor of it.

Mr. Post made an admirable speech, showing the motives of those who had inserted section 11, which would exempt land from taxation, no matter what its intrinsic value, so long as it was not divided up and plotted as building lots. The speaker showed that if this section was not eliminated valuable land would be used to grow potatoes upon, until such time as the population had increased to that extent that the owner could sell for a good-sized fortune.

The audience very early discerned the outlines of the cat, so much so that when Rev. S. W. Thackeray, who was the next speaker, moved a resolution declaring that the meeting was opposed to annexation under the proposed conditions at the present time, it was carried with but two dissentient votes.

One of the residents then moved, "That, as the bill was evidently framed in the interest of monopoly, and would further oppress the toiling masses, the representatives in the senate and assembly be requested to work and vote against its passage;" carried unanimously.

During the discussion which preceded the adoption of this resolution, several gentlemen present (not members of the club) announced themselves in favor of the single tax.

It was then moved and seconded that as those present had been very much edified and interested by the addresses of the Brooklyn single tax club, the supervisor be requested to refund the money paid by the club for the use of the town hall; carried unanimously.

During the progress of this meeting one of the members of the club was notified that a meeting of those in favor of the measure was being held at the house of one of the promoters. He immediately repaired there and found them very much disturbed over the meeting at the town hall. After making a speech showing the injustice of the proposed section, and decrying it as his opinion that the bill would not pass in its present shape, a motion to drop the objectionable clause was carried. The meeting then requested him to go to Albany and assist in getting the bill passed as amended. This he consented to do. The result of this contest will spur the club to fresh efforts to remedy some of the evils of local taxation.

James Hamilton, Eighteenth Ward.—The Eighteenth ward single tax club has organized permanently, and will meet every Tuesday at 8 p. m., at 253 Evergreen avenue. We have a large membership.

Herman G. Loew has moved here, and has joined the club.

Emily A. Deverall, Brooklyn, E. D.—The Eastern District single tax club will for the future hold meetings on Tuesday night of each week, the place of meeting also being changed from Oriental hall to W. C. T. W. hall, corner of South Third street and Bedford avenue.

Single taxers of the Swedenborgian faith attracted some attention at the recent convention of the New York association of the New church, held in Brooklyn. Mr. J. R. Waters of this city introduced the following resolution:

Whereas, At the annual meeting of this association held in February, 1883, the following resolution was passed, to wit:

"Resolved, That the association approves of the suggestion made by the president in his address that there should be a permanent fund for the support of the general pastorate, and that the executive committee be recommended to take such action in the matter as it may deem wise;" and

Whereas, No action has been taken to carry out the recommendation contained in the resolution save to receive small contributions of money toward the proposed fund; and

Whereas, It is the honest conviction of a large number of New church people that the perpetuation of an office is contrary to the spirit of the age, and that the support of an office by means of endowment funds is disorderly, and opposed to the heavenly doctrines of the New church; therefore be it now

Resolved, That the resolution referred to be and hereby is rescinded, the general pastorate permanent fund abolished and the treasurer instructed to return the contributions with the interest, if any, accrued thereon, to the donors of the contributions, and if any contribution cannot be so returned to merge the same into the general fund of the association.

Resolved, That the resolution referred to be and hereby is rescinded, the general pastorate permanent fund abolished and the treasurer instructed to return the contributions with the interest, if any, accrued thereon, to the donors of the contributions, and if any contribution cannot be so returned to merge the same into the general fund of the association.

ground of opposition to endowments as schemes for to live off the labor of others by the control of natural opportunities. One speaker in opposition to these gentlemen declared poverty a good thing. There was a motion to separate preamble and resolution, but finally a motion to table the rescinding resolution was carried by a vote of 25 to 0.

NEW YORK STATE.

T. E. Law, Bayside, Long Island.—J. W. Treadwell of Flushing is writing to our local paper a series of articles on the single tax. I have a communication in the Flushing Journal, calling upon the assessors to tax vacant lots more and reduce the taxes on houses, etc. I have also in the Long Island Times of the 22d an article calling attention to growing pauperism in our midst. We are taking advantage in every public way to bring the matter before the people.

R. B. Martis, Troy.—The lecture delivered under the auspices of the single tax club of Troy by Matthew Kirsch of Albany was a success. We had a good audience, who listened one hour and forty minutes to the remedy we propose for the social evils of today. The tract—"Thou Shall Not Steal"—was distributed, and a curiosity awakened which has resulted in considerable discussion. We are making preparations for a question meeting in the near future. The club is increasing in membership.

MASSACHUSETTS.

THE POLICY OF THE SINGLE TAX MEN—BOSTON MEN WANTED.

Edwin M. White, Charlestown, Boston.—As some fear has been expressed that single tax organization in Massachusetts was in

facture of paper, cotton, woolen goods and machinery, and the quarrying and dressing of granite, it seems to be able to hold only four or five single tax men; but those few ought to "get together," and prepare to enlighten the heathen. Let somebody call a meeting.

Edwin A. Hallett, Dorchester, Boston.—The petition gives me an opportunity to talk single tax in the cars and in my shop. The light is spreading.

J. N. Ryder, Wakefield.—We had a little club here once, but it has gone to sleep; so the few single tax men here work with the petition. We hope soon to revive our club.

CONNECTICUT.

A CLUB TO BE ORGANIZED IN BIRMINGHAM—GETTING SIGNATURES.

C. A. Pratt, Birmingham.—I am glad to see that the single tax movement is steadily gaining strength. I am in hopes to be able to report the organization of a tariff reform club in this place by another week, as a meeting of prominent democrats has been arranged for that purpose. A club of that sort once under headway will afford an opportunity for us single tax followers to inject a little genuine free trade leaven into the democratic lump.

G. D. McDonald, Waterbury.—I desire to report that I have added six to the number of single tax men in this section. Their previous affiliations were: Republicans, 3; democrats, 2; prohibitionist, 1.

PENNSYLVANIA.

AFRAID TO AVOW THE TRUTH THAT IS IN HIM—OBLIGED TO RUST, INSTEAD OF RUB.

Uncle Tom, Bryn Mawr.—There is an Episcopalian clergyman in Plainfield, N. J., who fully understands and is in favor of the single tax, but who has so far, for reasons best known to himself, declined to avow himself openly for it. I would respectfully advise single tax men in Plainfield and vicinity to kindly act upon Rev. Huntington's suggestion in *THE STANDARD* of January 15. If he refuses no harm is done and if he complies there will be one more moral teacher to join the "Single tax brotherhood of religious teachers." Either way only good can come of it.

Walter Owen, Philadelphia.—I try to help forward the work by getting signatures. Under different circumstances I would help financially, but I am one of the victims of a tariff on wool and woolens, and have been obliged to rust, instead of rub, most of the winter.

ILLINOIS.

WORK IN CHICAGO—A COUNTY CONFERENCE TO BE CALLED IN JUNE—LETTERS FROM OTHER PLACES.

Frank W. Irwin, Chicago.—At the meeting of February 20, the Chicago single tax club decided to call a conference of single taxers of Cook county, Illinois, some time in June ensuing, for the purpose of getting acquainted and encouraging greater activity and more effective work, and the below mentioned committee was appointed to make arrangements. The intention is to hold one or more afternoon conferences, and in the evenings of the same days public meetings will be addressed by good speakers. It is expected that every single taxer in the county will take pride in doing something to make the occasion a rousing success, to the extent at least of being present at the meetings with one or more friends. The committee wish to get an expression from their friends in different parts of the country as to the possible number of people in their immediate territory who will attend such meetings; also, any suggestions in furtherance of the plan will receive careful consideration. Communications should be addressed to Frank W. Irwin, room 835, "The Rookery," Chicago.

F. W. Irwin, Marshall! Beck, E. Osgood Brown, J. T. Ripley, J. C. Walsh, T. W. Wittler, H. W. MacFarlane, John O'Neil, J. B. Taylor, M. F. Bingham, R. H. Cowdry, E. H. Bailey, Axel Burman, M. J. Rowan, E. Eiting, committee.

Warren Worth Bailey, Chicago.—There was a good attendance at our meeting last night, February 28, in spite of the rain. Officers for the ensuing six months were nominated as follows: For president, Warren W. Bailey (renomination); first vice-president, Miss Leonora Beck; second vice-president, Hon. Jonathan B. Taylor; third vice-president, J. T. Ripley; secretary, J. M. Place and Frank W. Irwin. Mr. Wittler declining a second term, which the club was only too anxious to give him. His services have been of inestimable value to our organization, and I believe I express the sentiment of every member when I say as much.

Mr. George V. Wells was the speaker last night, and he gave us a very strong and eloquent talk on the Union stock yards' monopoly. His address was enthusiastically applauded, and Mr. James Malcolm, Mr. J. M. Place and others joined in the discussion that followed. Mr. E. Curtis, a grain man who used to be down at Vincennes, where my brother got him interested in "the cut," which he now sees in everything, will speak

next Thursday evening, and on the following Thursday Professor Petersen, the Scandinavian orator, will deliver an address on "The single tax in the light of the new church."

The work of the committee on local taxation is progressing under the energetic management of Chairman Ripley and Mr. James Malcolm. Two reports have been printed in the Daily News and a third (prepared by Mr. Malcolm) will appear in tomorrow morning's News. The fact brought out have been startling, and they have attracted wide attention.

At last night's meeting a committee was appointed to draft a memorial to the mayor and the city council, praying for a special committee to investigate and report upon the question of local taxation. We hope thus to get a wider discussion of the barbaric system now prevailing than has yet been had, and perhaps some practical good may be accomplished. Anyhow, it will stir up the assessors.

W. B. Steers, Chicago.—We are making great headway in Chicago; the papers are all discussing the single tax question in connection with the big drainage question now about to be commenced, and the Chicago Daily News comes out flatly and says the property benefited should stand the cost; that it is just and right; that where a public improvement adds to the value of land the landlords should stand the cost of the improvement. We are making wonderful headway.

G. A. Randall, Cairo.—In my travels for signatures to the petition I am finding many believers in the single tax. I feel so much encouraged that I intend to press the work which heretofore has been approached timidly. Among the K. of L. men here are many advocates. I intend to try to spread the idea among the railroad men here, and in a short time I hope to see the formation of a club.

E. A. White, East Dubuque.—My age and infirmities prevent me from doing much work, but I am glad to see that our younger friends are in earnest. They are teaching the true doctrine in the highways and the byways, and in organizations everywhere around here they are bringing George's theories to the front. There's a good time coming; wait a little longer.

Robert Cumming, Du Quoin.—Our Sunday afternoon meetings are doing much good. Last Sunday, February 23, James Boston spoke on "Hard Times—the Cause and Remedy," in which we were agreeably surprised to hear him declare that the single tax was the only feasible remedy that had been offered. Revs. J. J. Harns, A. J. Fishback and I followed.

MARYLAND.

TWO NEW CLUBS ORGANIZED IN BALTIMORE—COLORED MEN FORM A CLUB.

W. H. Kelly, Baltimore.—I have been instructed to inform *THE STANDARD* of the organization of a single tax society whose motto will be, "Free trade, free land, free men." We propose to push the work to the best of our ability and we hope to accomplish large results. The officers of the organization are as follows: J. G. Schonfath, president; Arthur Sachse, vice-president and W. H. Kelly, secretary-treasurer. The organization will be known as the Baltimore single tax society, and will meet every Sunday evening at Industrial hall, 316 West Lombard street, at 8 p. m.

William N. Hill, Baltimore.—The single tax association of East Baltimore was organized February 27, at Samaritan temple, by the election of J. M. Ralph as president, Charles H. Williams as secretary and William D. Williams as treasurer. This association is composed of colored men, adherents of the single tax doctrine.

S. T. Baltimore.—A. H. Stephenson, secretary of the Henry George club of Philadelphia, on Monday, March 3, spoke before the Single tax league on "How to increase wages and profits."

KENTUCKY.

A BOARD OF COUNCILMEN ASK THE LEGISLATURE TO CHANGE THE SYSTEM OF TAXATION.

Joseph L. Schraer, Newport.—At the last meeting of the board of councilmen of the city of Newport, Ky., a resolution to exempt all personal property from taxation was offered. The resolution was adopted by unanimous consent, and Mr. John S. Ducker, a prominent attorney, was authorized to draw up a bill to be presented to the legislature, and to use his influence, backed up by the sentiment of the citizens of Newport, to have the bill passed. The bill, as prepared by him, is as follows:

An act to amend the charter of the city of Newport, exempting certain personal property from taxation.

Be it enacted by the general assembly of the commonwealth of Kentucky:

Section 1.—That all moneys, notes, mortgages, bonds, building-association shares, stocks and shares in action of every kind and character, all tools and machinery used in manufacturing establishments, and also all raw material used in such establishments and manufactured stock thereof, shall be ex-

empt from all taxation or assessments of any kind or character for municipal purposes by the city of Newport.

Section 2.—All laws and parts of laws having special application to the city of Newport, in so far as the same are in conflict with this act, are hereby repealed.

Section 3.—This act shall take effect from and after its passage.

Approved by and received the unanimous vote of city council.

There has been no organized effort to bring this about, but it has been done by the quiet and energetic efforts of individuals. I expressed my regrets to Mr. Ducker that the council had stopped here and not exempted everything except land values. He advised me to cheer up; that it was only a question of a short time when my wishes would be gratified. I hope this will further spur the single tax men on to renewed efforts.

Isaac B. Sparks, Franklin.—I have been reading a copy of *THE STANDARD* to our Methodist minister and a short time ago requested him to read "Progress and Poverty," which he has done. The other day he told me that he accepts the doctrine set forth in that book, and that he purposes writing to you. I now take ten copies of *THE STANDARD* which I send to people whom I think are likely to become interested in the work we are doing.

The Wheelers are very numerous in this part of the state, and I have interested a school teacher who is a prominent member of the order.

I wish a single tax club would be organized in Louisville. I am almost ashamed of "Old Kentucky" single tax men for not forcing our beloved state to march abreast of other states in the grandest movement of modern times.

J. W. Greene, Louisville.—By way of encouragement I can say that I positively believe that this city is getting ripe to join the stampede in the near future, but I have no hope for the state; but when such states as Kansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and others too numerous to mention, will have swung into the single tax line, old Kentucky will be found at the tail end of the procession.

TENNESSEE.

THE TRADES COUNCIL OF MEMPHIS COMES CLOSE TO THE SINGLE TAX—OTHER GOOD NEWS.

R. G. Brown, Memphis.—The trades council, an organization composed of representatives of all the trades unions in Memphis, has come as near the single tax as it could without hitting it. The council held a meeting in the criminal court room on the evening of Washington's birthday for the purpose of considering the eight-hour movement. Mr. Bolton Smith and myself had been invited to present the relations between the single tax and the eight-hour movement. We met with some opposition from advocates of eight hours pure and simple, but found, to our surprise, an able and earnest single tax advocate in the person of Mr. S. W. Harmon, who represented the cigarmakers' union in the council. Mr. Harmon gave some facts in his experience in his trade which showed that not even under eight hours could the workingmen secure the relief they so much desired. At the conclusion of his speech he offered the subjoined resolutions and urged the meeting to adopt them as the expression of the sentiments of the trades council, stating that they had been unanimously adopted by his own union at a recent meeting. The following are the resolutions:

Whereas, As workingmen and mechanics, we feel that the distribution of the products of labor is such that it gives to us an inadequate and unjust proportion of what we produce; and

Whereas, We see that capital engaged in active production, and that the employees themselves, who risk their money, are frequently losers, we are led to look for other causes for the inadequate and unjust distribution of the products of our labor, of which we complain; and

Whereas, We believe we find such causes in an unjust system of taxation, in the locking up of great sums in land held for purposes of speculation which interferes with production of wealth; and

Whereas, The value of property belongs rightfully only to those who create it; and

Whereas, It is injurious to the interest of the whole people that land should be held for speculation; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we demand that all unoccupied land be taxed at the price for which it is held for sale; that it shall be the duty of owners of such land to fix their selling price to the authorized officers, and that the first comer who offers the amount so fixed shall be entitled to such property.

Resolved, That as all increased value given to unimproved land comes by virtue of settlement, and improvement in the neighborhood by the community at large, all such increased value in justice belongs to the community, and we demand of our representatives in the legislature that they pass laws which will secure this value to the community.

Resolved, That we recognize in its entirety the principle that all men have an equal natural right to the benefits of all natural opportunities; be it further

Resolved, That for the surer and quieter obtaining of the above amending legislation it is the sense of this council that a more perfect connection should be established with similar organizations in this state with the object of concentrating our efforts and energies to attain these ends.

About ninety per cent of the Knights of Labor here are free traders and single taxers, a result due mainly to the efforts of Mr. Bolton Smith, who is a member of the local assembly.

We were officially notified last Thursday that our doctrine had been indorsed by the Star center alliance of Carroll county, Miss., in these words:

Resolved, That this lodge is in favor of the single tax, and that we may more fully understand the work of the single tax association, the secretary is instructed to write to Mr. Bolton Smith and ask that he furnish us with tracts.

The constant demand for tracts and sample copies of *THE STANDARD* which we receive every day is rapidly exhausting our stock. We have heard from a number of the legislators of Mississippi, Alabama and Arkansas indorsing the single tax, and have letters from ten or twelve leading men in the Farmers and laborers' union to the same effect. The Memphis single tax association is making itself felt in this section, and considering its numbers and means is doing a tremendous work.

MISSOURI.

FATHER HUNTINGTON RECEIVES AN OVATION IN ST. LOUIS—WORKING ON THE CLERGY OF KANSAS CITY.

Percy Pepon, St. Louis.—A splendid audience at Music hall, Wednesday night, listened to Rev. J. O. S. Huntington's lecture on "Problems that Confront Us." The speaker was introduced by Mayor Noonan. The mayor said that he would not attempt, in introducing Father Huntington, to say anything upon the problem of the distribution of wealth; but he hoped before long, from that or some other platform, to lend the aid of his own voice in favor of more equitable social conditions. Father Huntington was received with a great demonstration of enthusiasm, and announced in beginning his address that he would devote very little time to the statement of the social problems, but would speak chiefly of the way in which they should be met. Then followed a logical and eloquent single tax argument, repeatedly interrupted with applause.

At the conclusion of the lecture, Father Huntington answered questions for half an hour, every answer being as apt and explicit as though he had devoted weeks to the consideration of each particular question and the condensing of his reply. A feature of the evening was when, in reply to one auditor, who asked how to go practically about getting the single tax, Father Huntington began, "Abolish the tariff"—at this point he was interrupted by a tremendous burst of applause, mingled with shouts and accompanied by waving hats and handkerchiefs. During the demonstration the speaker smilingly surveyed the scene, and as soon as he could make himself heard, he finished his answer. The address evidently had a great effect upon the audience.

Henry W. Allen, Kansas City.—We intend to send a copy of George's Glasgow address to every clergymen in this city, with the following letter:

Dear Sir: Herewith please find a copy of a sermon entitled "Thy Kingdom Come."

The Kansas City single tax club sends this, hoping thereby to interest you in the cause it represents. This is a movement founded upon sound economic principles, having for its end the adoption of measures that will abolish industrial slavery. As the church has the welfare of the entire community at heart, as well as the spiritual culture of individuals, the following principles that underlie the single tax movement are most respectfully offered for your attention:

(1) The world is rich enough in natural resources to support ten times its present population; therefore poverty is the fault of man, and man alone.

(2) By the use of modern labor-saving machinery and facilities for exchange, the breadwinner should be correspondingly better off than were his ancestors, instead of which the struggle for existence is sharper, and the proportion of unemployed is larger than ever before.

(3) It being granted that one has a right to life, it follows that one must have land to live on as well as air to breathe or water to drink.

(4) Land of itself has no value; the presence of man gives it value. The more men the greater the value. Therefore the value of land—not land itself—belongs to the existing community, and out of it all public expenses should be paid.

(5) The present system of taxation is unjust in that it falls heaviest upon those least able to bear it; it is pernicious in that it puts a premium on perfidy, and it is irrational because it fines industry and discourages production and hinders trade.

(6) The single tax would be fair to all, easy of application, and by its operation would abolish involuntary poverty. It is a matter of practical religion, and for it, as such, your sympathy and support is earnestly solicited.

Adopted by the K. C. S. T. club at its regular meeting, February 20, 1890.

H. W. Allen, Kansas City.—Just now the papers are devoting considerable space to the Kansas farmer. It seems that after a bounteous harvest the price of corn is so low and the freight charges so high that he is about as badly off as in previous years when his crops were small, or garnered by the grasshopper. The governor has recently taken action in the matter, and as a result the railroads have conceded an emergency reduction in rates for a limited time. But the

grain commission men at this point say that the benefit to the farmers will after all be very little. According to all reports the farmers are beginning to see through the protection humbug.

The Star is doing splendid work for tariff reform. So is the Times.

The Australian ballot has been adopted by our city. All parties favor it here. We have a new law here that imposes a poll tax of \$2.50 that can be paid by voting—amounting to a fine for not voting. The tax has to be paid by all those who have not been here long enough to vote. So it is worth something to be an old resident.

J. W. Swaw, Highgate.—The other night I called a meeting at the Collier school house, Oak Hill, and organized another single tax league, with F. Debolt as chairman and J. W. Miller secretary.

MINNESOTA.

ENCOURAGING NEWS FROM MINNEAPOLIS—ANOTHER NEWSPAPER INTERESTED.

C. J. Buell, Minneapolis.—Two weeks ago I addressed a meeting of farmers at Lakeville, with good results. Among the signers to the petition sent to the committee are the principal of the graded school at Lakeville and a prominent farmer. I am of the opinion that when the farmers once see the merits of the reform not many of them will stay out. There are certain wards in Minneapolis where more than half the voters would be single tax men if the question were to come up for a vote. Things are moving here with wonderful rapidity.

S. T., Minneapolis.—Father Huntington is to visit us shortly.

S. T., Fergus Falls.—The Journal is giving considerable space to the single tax. A late issue has nearly a column on the editorial page to an explanation of our plan.

KANSAS.

WANTS HIS NAME ON THE LIST OF "WORKERS"—FARMERS HARD PRESSED.

John W. Baldwin, Kansas City.—Please place my name on the list of "workers." I have been doing some work here among the colored people, of whom we have a large population. I induced a teacher and two lawyers (all colored) to read "Progress and Poverty," and they are now enthusiasts like myself. They see the single tax would solve the race problem. Ingall's buncome falls flat with them. I keep urging them to go to proselyting among their brethren and they get promise me so to do as soon as they get better informed.

Robert M. Quirk, Orono, Norton County.—Farmers here are hard pressed to live, and the majority of us are losing ground. We are robbed on every side. Railroad rapacity, 3 per cent money and a sneak-thief tariff leave us no margin to clear our indebtedness, to say nothing of a surplus for emergencies. Our hard toil in sun and wind avail us nothing. Unless there is a radical change soon, death will be the poor man's kindest and best friend. I occasionally read the members some pieces from THE STANDARD, and think I have been in a measure successful in getting some out of the old rut. Many farmers who a short time ago were orthodox protectionists are beginning to realize that it is a little one-sided and that they are somehow not the ones who get the pap.

S. T., Wichita.—The Democrat, a weekly paper lately started here, has a friendly side for our movement.

COLORADO.

A DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION ADOPTS THE SINGLE TAX.

Charles Ford, Denver.—I am in the restaurant business here, and consequently come in contact with a great many strangers, not only to me, but also to the single tax. When I see a man disposed to talk I talk single tax, free trade and the Australian ballot system to him, and can generally wind up by inducing him to sign a blank for the petition. When I succeed in getting one to sign a blank I generally have him put a few in his pockets for his friends.

John W. Hawhurst, Hawhurst.—We have been quiet here for some time past, but intend to again go actively to work. I have sent to the committee for petition blanks; and as soon as I receive them I will call a meeting of the club who will make a raid on the country for signatures. The local democratic organization has put the single tax plank in their platform, and we expect to see the next democratic state convention do the same.

OHIO.

H. Hubbard, Painesville.—One farmer here who owns several hundred acres of land has been reading "Progress and Poverty," sees the error and acknowledges the corn.

INDIANA.

Frank D. Blue, Terre Haute.—Things are moving very slowly here, as we are so few, but the cause is spreading all the time. All opportunities are being watched, and I think before long we will have quite a large num-

ber here. The public library now keeps THE STANDARD on file.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Joseph H. Sage, Wellsburg, Brooke County.—The single tax idea is not sneered at as much as it used to be, so I feel encouraged. I am delighted to see in THE STANDARD the progress that is being made all over the country. People sign the petition who would not have looked at it a year ago.

MICHIGAN.

William Mitchell, Saginaw City.—I like the work of getting signatures to the petition, as it nearly always starts an argument. When hide bound high protectionists decline to sign on the ground that they "don't think free trade is right," I ask them if they think their cause so weak that they are afraid to have it discussed. They profess to be indignant, but they sign.

FLORIDA.

F. Warden, St. Augustine.—Prolonged absence from home has prevented me from pushing work in behalf of the single tax, but my wife, who is a bonny single tax worker, tells me the K. of L. here have signed sixty petitions, this being their total membership. It is encouraging to know they have to a man indorsed the movement. Our next step, I expect, will be to secure a good speaker for such an audience, and do all we can to present to each member the beauties of the single tax in all its unquestionable efficiency and moral grandeur, so that each may accept our principles on their merits.

By the bye, if you thought it well to follow up a stray shot of mine, you might induce some of our Canadian friends to go for (easily) the Leamington Post, Ontario, Canada. The editor shows some concern as to the present state of things, and is, I think, open to conviction as to the best solution of the social and industrial questions. His paper may not have more than a local circulation, but it has a highly moral tone.

ALABAMA.

Joseph Stokes, Coalburg, Jefferson county.—The K. of L. here indorse the single tax, and I believe that the political party of the future will stand on it. I have sent to the enrollment committee for petitions, and expect to have success with them.

LOUISIANA.

A. Hilton, Alexandria.—Our district judge and Benjamin F. Scott were standing together on a corner of the street here in Alexandria, and I walked up. Being well acquainted with both of them, I laid my hand on Scott's shoulder and said: "Judge, here is a man I would rather convert to Georgeism than any other man in the parish." The judge answered: "But you can't do it." Scott spoke and said: "I only want a point or two cleared up to make me a George man." I said no more. Scott is a thinking man, and has more influence with the pine woods farmers than any other man in the parish.

TEXAS.

J. H. Hall, McGregor.—It is easy to get signers to the petition. I have been trying the school-house debates and have had good success. I have captured a prominent Presbyterian preacher and several good farmers, and have got some more looking after the "cat."

MONTANA.

Walter Kleinsorge, Helena.—While I was in Butte lately I learned that there were several single tax men in that camp who meant to start a club shortly. By this time they have done so. The number of single tax advocates in this place is growing, and the idea is spreading, especially so among former republican protectionists. This new state, and especially Helena, is a good field for propaganda, for wild speculation is rampant in its most exciting form.

CALIFORNIA.

W. G. Sellers, San Francisco.—Last Saturday evening, February 16, before the Y. M. C. A. Lyceum, Judge Maguire delivered an address upon the single tax that was well received and evidently produced a good impression. After the address some time was devoted to answering questions. After adjournment, many of the members crowded around the judge for further discussion and information, in a very friendly spirit.

On Sunday evening, February 17, the regular weekly meeting of the single tax society was addressed by one of our comparatively new members, Mr. L. M. Mansur. Subject, "Who has changed?" Mr. Mansur is an old republican, one of the original members of that party, and his discourse was devoted to showing that in parting with his old political associates in that party not he, but they, had changed. Since Mr. George's advent, we are having plenty of single tax, pro and con, in the papers, both editorially and in correspondence.

THE TRIANGLE BUILDING LOAN AND SAVINGS FUND.

This improved plan of building and loan association will be explained at a public meeting, to be held at 66 Livingston street, Brooklyn, on Thursday evening, March 6.

The objects and purposes of the Order of the Triangle will also be explained at this meeting. The speakers will be Charles O'Connor, Hennessy, Magnus Gross, jr., George White, and others. Homeseekers and those who wish to become their own bankers, should take advantage of the great power of these associations for either investment or loans and attend this meeting.

IRRESISTIBLE TO HONEST INVESTIGATORS.

The New Earth.

John Filmer spoke in the New church house of worship in Paterson, N. J., on Sunday evening, January 12. The subject of Mr. Filmer's address was "Man's birthright; how he has lost it, and how it must be regained." In dismissing the congregation, the Rev. B. D. Palmer, the pastor of the church, advised those present to study the single tax, and stated that it had withstood the criticism of the ablest minds the world over, and that, in his opinion, no intelligent man upon careful study of the question could condemn it. Arrangements are being made to have another single tax lecture at the same place.

HE'S WORTH IT, BUT HASN'T GOT IT. Quincy, Ill., Journal of Industry.

Henry George, so Bradstreet says, is worth over one million dollars.

Consumption Cured.

An old physician, retired from practice, having had placed in his hands by an East India missionary the formula of a simple vegetable remedy for the speedy and permanent cure of Consumption, Bronchitis, Catarrh, asthma and all throat and lung affections, and a positive and radical cure for Nervous Disease and all nervous complaints, after having tested its wonderful curative powers in thousands of cases, has felt it his duty to make it known to his surviving followers. Assisted by this motive and desire to relieve human suffering, I will send free of charge to all who desire it this recipe, in German, French or English, with full directions for preparing and using. Sent by mail by addressing Wm. S. Noyes, 330 Powers' Block, Rochester, N. Y.

ELY'S CREAM BALM

\$1,000
TO ANY MAN,
WOMAN OR CHILD
Suffering from

CATARRH
NOT A LIQUID
or SNUFF.
HAY-FEVER

A particle is applied into each nostril and is agreeable to use. Price 50 cents at Druggists; by mail, registered. ELY BROTHERS, 5 Warren St., New York.

"The trouble with stenographers is, they can't read their notes." This is the opinion of a business man who tried, one after another, a dozen or more young men and women. No wonder they can't read accurately, nor write rapidly either, considering the hieroglyphic systems that most of them use.

MACGREGOR & JONES,
Publishers to Teachers,
19 Union Square, New York.

GRAPHIC SHORTHAND
the script joined vowel system, without "shading" or position" is as health & easy print, and can be learned in half the time required to learn a geometric system. Complete text book, \$1.50. Send for circular giving sample of writing and comparison of systems.

ACTIVE AGENTS. Prices, \$7 to \$190. Our special \$14 Watch is the best watch made for Railroad use. We guarantee our prices to be the very lowest at which articles of equal quality can be sold, and we pay extra to our customers fully. We refer to our agents in every city.

We have selling agents in every large city. Write at once to THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO., 101 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

CATARRH.

Catarrhal Deafness—Hay Fever—A New Home Treatment.

Sufferers are not generally aware that these diseases are contagious, or that they are due to the presence of living parasites in the lining membrane of the nose and eustachian tubes. Microscopic research, however, has proved this to be a fact, and the result of this discovery is that a simple remedy has been formulated whereby catarrh, catarrhal deafness and hay fever are permanently cured in from one to three simple applications made at home by the patient once in two weeks.

N. B.—This treatment is not a snuff or an ointment; both have been discarded by reputable physicians as injurious. A pamphlet explaining this new treatment is sent free on receipt of stamp to pay postage, by A. H. Dixon & Son, 337 and 339 West King street, Toronto, Canada.—[Christian Advocate.]

Sufferers from Catarrhal troubles should carefully read the above.—[Adv.]

If you have a COLD or COUGH, acute or leading to CONSUMPTION,

SCOTT'S EMULSION

OF PURE COD LIVER OIL
AND HYDROPHOSPHITES
OF LIME AND SODA

IS SURE CURE FOR IT.

This preparation contains the stimulating properties of the Hydrophosphites and fine Norwegian Cod Liver Oil. Used by physicians all the world over. It is as palatable as milk. Three times as efficacious as plain Cod Liver Oil. A perfect Emulsion, better than all others made. For all forms of Wasting Diseases, Bronchitis,

CONSUMPTION, Scrofula, and as a Flesh Producer there is nothing like SCOTT'S EMULSION. It is sold by all Druggists. Let no one by profuse explanation or impudent entreaty induce you to accept a substitute.

Is your Watch worth A Dollar?

Then protect it from pick-pockets by getting an ANTI-PICKPOCKET SWIVEL (Patented Feb. 8, 1887.)

THE ONLY SAFEGUARD. ALWAYS ON HAND. IN ORDER.

Only \$1. Mailed postpaid on receipt of price.

You Want full particulars about the best watches made, our Keystone Dust-Proof and our mode of selling them at \$1 a 35¢. We guarantee you absolutely against loss. Exclusive territory given to Active Agents. Prices, \$7 to \$190. Our special \$14 Watch is the best watch made for Railroad use. We guarantee our prices to be the very lowest at which articles of equal quality can be sold, and we pay extra to our customers fully. We refer to our agents in every city.

We have selling agents in every large city. Write at once to THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO., 101 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

Pennsylvania Agricultural Works, York, Pa.

Tarquhar's Standard Engines and Saw Mills. Send for Catalogue. Portable, Stationary, Traction and Automatic Engines especially. Warranties and guarantees superior to any made.

Address A. B. TARQUHAR & SON, York, Pa.

HEAVEN AND HELL.

By EMANUEL SWEDENBORG. Four hundred and twenty pages, paper cover. Mailed pre-paid for 14 cents by the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society, 30 Cooper Union, New York City.

PAINLESS EFFECTUAL BEECHAM'S PILLS

WORTH A GUINEA A BOX.

For Millions and Millions Disorders, such as Wind and Pain in the Stomach, Nicker Headache, Cholera, Typhus, Fevers, and Distressing after Meals, Dizziness and Drunkenness, Headache, Distressings of Heart, Loss of Appetite, Shortness of Breath, Convulsions, Neuralgia, Rheumatism, &c. Take FIVE DOWNS WILL GIVE RELIEF IN TWENTY MINUTES. This is no fiction. Every sufferer is earnestly invited to try one box of these pills, and they will be amazed.

BEECHAM'S PILLS, taken as directed, will quickly restore females to complete health. For a

WEAK STOMACH; IMPAIRED DIGESTION; CONSTIPATION; SICK HEADACHE; DISORDERED LIVER;

they ACT LIKE MAGIC—few doses will work wonders upon the Vital Organs; Strengthening the muscular system; restoring lost complexion; bringing back the keen edge of appetite and the whole physical energy of the human frame. The secret of their success is that BEECHAM'S PILLS HAVE NO EQUAL.

Prepared only by THOMAS BEECHAM, M. A., Lancashire, England.

Sold by Druggists especially. R. W. ALLEN, 40, 546 and 547 Canal St., New York.

WILL MAIL BEECHAM'S PILLS ON RECEIPT OF PAYMENT, 25 CENTS A BOX.

Send me a few of your droppings. An offering from the Standard.

SINGLE TAX ORGANIZATIONS.

(Secretaries of clubs are requested to send any corrections in the list below, and all newly formed organizations are asked to report promptly, either to the Enrollment committee or The Standard.)

ARKANSAS.

LITTLE ROCK.—Little Rock single tax club. Every alternate Thursday evening, 717 Main st. Pres., Sol F. Clark; sec., O. D. Hemming, 1910 Main st.

CALIFORNIA.

SAN FRANCISCO.—California single tax society. Every Sunday evening, St. George's hall, 903½ Market st. Library and reading room open from 9 a.m. to 10 p.m., 841 Market st. Pres., H. L. Pleace; sec., G. A. Hubbard. Address of all officers, 841 Market st.

SACRAMENTO.—Single tax club of Sacramento. Every Friday evening, Dr. Reed's office, 6th and K sts. Pres., Dr. Thos. B. Reed; sec., C. W. Farnsworth, 1406 4th st.

OAKLAND.—Single tax club No. 1 meets every Friday evening at St. Andrews hall, 1056½ Broadway. Pres., A. J. Gregg; sec., E. Hadkins.

LOS ANGELES.—Los Angeles single tax club. Pres., A. J. Gray; sec., Clarence A. Gray, rooms 24-25 Bryson-Bouebrake block.

SAN DIEGO.—San Diego single tax county committee. Every Monday evening, 139 10th st. Chairman, Geo. B. Whaley, Novelette book stand, 439 Fifth st.

BLACK DIAMOND.—Contra Costa county single tax committee. Jeff. A. Bailey, sec.

COLORADO.

STATE.—Colorado State single tax association, room 14, Byers block, 15th and Champa sts. Pres., A. W. Elder; sec., H. C. Niles; treas., Geo. Champion.

DENVER.—Denver single tax association. Every Thursday evening, room 14, Byers block, 15th and Champa sts. Free reading room open every day, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Pres., G. H. Phelps; sec., F. H. Monroe, 251 Marion st.

PUEBLO.—Commonwealth single tax club. First and Fourth Thursdays at office of D. B. V. Reeve, Union av. Pres., D. B. V. Reeve; sec., J. W. Breitlinger, Pueblo Smelting and Refining Co.

GRAND JUNCTION.—Mesa county single tax and ballot reform club. Pres., James W. Bucklin; sec., Geo. Smith.

CANYON CITY.—Single tax committee; sec., Dr. Frank P. Blake.

HAWKSHURST.—Plateau Valley single tax club. Pres., John W. Hawkshurst; sec., E. H. Parkenson.

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN.—Tax reform club. Every Friday evening, room 11, 102 Orange st. Pres., Willard D. Warren; sec., Alfred Smith, 105 Dury st.

MERIDEN.—Meriden single tax club. 3 p.m. every Sunday, Circle hall. Pres., Wm. Hawthorne; sec., Wm. Williss, P. O. box 1342.

DAKOTA.

STATE.—South Dakota single tax association. Pres., Judge Levi Metcalf of Rapid City; sec., W. E. Brokaw, box 146, Bristol.

RAPID CITY.—Black Hills single tax league. Last Saturday in each month, Library hall. Pres., Judge Levi Metcalf; sec., Francis H. Clark.

MADISON.—Lake county single tax club. Chairman, Prof. E. H. Evanson.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON.—Washington single tax league; always open; regular meeting Friday evening, 609 F street, N. W. Pres., Paul T. Bowen; sec., Wm. Geddes, M. D., 1719 G st., N. W.

FLORIDA.

PENSACOLA.—Pensacola single tax club No. 1. Tuesdays evenings, K. of L. hall, corner of Zaragoza and Palafax sts. Pres., J. Davis Wolfe; sec., James McHugh.

TAMPA.—Thomas G. Shearman single tax league. First Monday in each month, business meeting; Sundays, public speaking. Pres., C. E. Ainsworth; sec., John H. McCormick.

GEORGIA.

ATLANTA, Ga.—Atlanta single tax club No. 1. Pres., J. M. Beath; sec., J. Healey Smith, 67 Whitehall st.

AUGUSTA.—Augusta single tax club. Every Friday evening, Hussar hall. Pres., Ed. Flury; sec., George Haines, care of Loftin & Meyer.

ILLINOIS.

CHICAGO.—Single tax club No. 1. Every Thursday evening, club room 4, Grand Pacific hotel. Pres., Warren Worth Bailey; sec., T. W. Wittler, 420 Milwaukee ave.

SPRINGFIELD.—Sangamon single tax club. Pres., Joseph Farris; sec., James H. McCrea, 623 Black ave.

JACKSONVILLE.—Morgan county single tax club. Pres., Col. Wm. Cannon of Murrayville; sec., Chas. W. Alexander of Jacksonville.

SPARTA.—Single tax committee. Sec., Wm. R. Bailey.

QUINCY.—Gem City single tax club. Every Friday evening, Opera house building. Pres., C. F. Perry; sec., Duke Schroer, 327 S. 3d.

INDIANA.

STATE.—Indiana single tax league. Pres., Henry Rawie, Anderson; vice-pres., L. P. Custer, Indianapolis; sec., Thos. J. Hudson, 155 Elm st., Indianapolis. State executive committee, Henry Rawie, Anderson; S. W. Williams, Vincennes; L. O. Bishop, Clinton; Dr. C. A. Kersey, Richmond; Chas. G. Bennett, Evansville; Wm. Henry, Connersville; W. E. McDermut, Ft. Wayne; T. J. Hudson, J. F. White, L. P. Custer, Indianapolis.

CLINTON.—Single tax club. Sunday afternoons, 3 o'clock, Argus office. Pres., W. V. Wells; sec., L. O. Bishop.

FORT WAYNE.—Single tax club. Pres., W. E. McDermut; vice-pres., J. M. Schwerzenge; sec., Henry Cohen.

INDIANAPOLIS.—Indianapolis single tax league. Every Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Mansur hall, n. e. cor. Washington and Alabama sts. Pres., Dr. Brown; sec., L. P. Custer.

EVANSVILLE.—Single tax association. Pres., Edwin Walker; sec., Charles G. Bennett.

RICHMOND.—Single tax club. Pres., C. S. Schneider, 105 South Third st.; sec., M. Richie, 913 South A st.

IOWA.

BURLINGTON.—Burlington single tax club. First and third Wednesday of each month, 813 Jefferson st. Pres., Richard Spencer; sec., Wilbur Moosa, 900 Hedge ave.

DES MOINES.—Single tax club. Pres., H. B. Allison, box 4; sec., J. Ballancee.

COUNCIL BLUFFS.—Council Bluffs single tax club; second and fourth Sunday of each month, 2:30 p.m.; 724 Sixth st. Pres., Chas. W. Benson; sec., L. Kinnahan, 304 W. Broadwater.

ALLERTON.—Tax reform club. Every Thursday evening, Vest's hall. Pres., A. J. Moran; sec., D. D. Shirley.

MASON CITY.—Single tax committee; 1st and 3d evenings of each month at Dr. Osborne's office. Pres., J. A. Seranton; sec., J. S. Mott.

KANSAS.—Single tax club. Pres., C. W. Brooks; vice-pres., H. Charters; sec., A. L. Russel.

GROVE HILL.—Grove Hill single tax club. Thursday evenings, Grove Hill school house, Lincoln township, Dickman county. Pres., E. Z. Butcher; sec., Andrew Reddick.

LOUISIANA.—Single tax club. Pres., J. A. Seranton; sec., J. S. Mott.

NEW ORLEANS.—Louisiana single tax club. Second, third and fourth Thursdays of each month, at 205 Canal st. Pres., John S. Waters, Maritime association; sec., Geo. W. Roberts, 326 Thalia st.

MAINE.—Single tax club. Saturday evenings, room 3, Phoenix block, Main st.; reading room open every evening. Pres., Thos. Marsden; sec., W. E. Jackson, 1227½ st.

LEWISTON.—Single tax committee. Every Wednesday evening, 73 Summer st. Chairman, F. D. Lyford; sec., Joseph Walsh, 73 Summer st.

MARYLAND.—Single tax league of Maryland. Every Thursday evening, Druid hall, cor. Jay and Baltimore sts. Pres., Wm. J. Ogden; sec., J. W. Jones, 31 N. Caroline st.

Baltimore single tax society. Every Sunday evening, 8 p.m., at Industrial hall, 316 W. Lombard st.

MASSACHUSETTS.—Single tax league of Massachusetts. Boston single tax league, Wells' memorial hall. Pres., Hamlin Garland; sec., Edwin M. White, 27 Pemberton square.

Neponset single tax league. Every Thursday evening, 389½ Neponset ave., Boston. Sec., Q. A. Lothrop, 43 Walnut st.

Dorchester single tax club. Every other Wednesday evening, Field's building, Field's Corner. Pres., Ed Frost; sec., John Lavis, 13 Leonard st.

Roxbury single tax club. Pres., Frank W. Mendrum; sec., Henry C. Romaine, 250 Rutgers st.

Stoneham single tax league. Pres., Dr. W. Symington Brown, Stoneham.

LYNN.—Lynn single tax league. Pres., C. H. Libby st., 331 Washington st.; sec., John McCarthy, 140 Tunson st.

WORCESTER.—Tenth district single tax league of Worcester. Meetings first Thursday of each month, class room, Y. M. C. A. building, 20 Pearl st. Pres., Thomas J. Hastings; sec., Edwin K. Page, Lake View, Worcester.

LAWRENCE.—Lawrence single tax club. Every Thursday evening, Col. J. P. Sweeney's office. Pres., Dr. W. Symington Brown, Stoneham.

LYNN.—Lynn single tax league. Pres., C. H. Libby st., 331 Washington st.; sec., John McCarthy, 140 Tunson st.

WORCESTER.—Tenth district single tax league of Worcester. Meetings first Thursday of each month, class room, Y. M. C. A. building, 20 Pearl st. Pres., Thomas J. Hastings; sec., Edwin K. Page, Lake View, Worcester.

STONEHAM.—Stoneham single tax league. Pres., Dr. W. Symington Brown, Stoneham.

LYNN.—Lynn single tax league. Pres., C. H. Libby st., 331 Washington st.; sec., John McCarthy, 140 Tunson st.

WORCESTER.—Tenth district single tax league of Worcester. Meetings first Thursday of each month, class room, Y. M. C. A. building, 20 Pearl st. Pres., Thomas J. Hastings; sec., Edwin K. Page, Lake View, Worcester.

SYRACUSE.—Syracuse single tax club. 113 Walton street. Pres., F. A. Paul; sec., H. R. Perry, 149 South Clinton st.

POUGHKEEPSIE.—Single tax club. Every Thursday evening, 8 p.m., 226 Union st. Pres., W. C. Albro; sec., F. S. Arnold.

AUBURN.—Single tax club. Mondays, 7:30 p.m., College hall. Pres., Dan. Peacock; sec., H. W. Benedict, 6 Morris st.

ELLENVILLE.—Single tax club of Ellenville. First and third Monday of each month, Canal st., over E. Bevier's drug store. Pres., Wm. Lambard; sec., Benj. Hull.

NEWBURYPORT.—Merriam assembly. Saturday evenings, 48 State st. Pres., Dennis F. Murphy; sec., W. R. Whitmore, 236 Merriam st.

MALDEN.—Single tax club. Meetings fortnightly at Deliberative hall, Pleasant st. Pres., Geo. W. Cox, Glenwood st.; sec., Edwin T. Clark, 100 Tremont st.

MICHIGAN.—Sturgis club of investigation. Every Tuesday evening, C. Jacob's justice court room. Pres., Rufus Spalding; sec., Thomas Harding.

SAGINAW.—Single tax club, rooms 413 Genesee av., East Saginaw. Pres., Edward L. Weggeler; sec., Jas. Duffy, 803 State st.

MINNESOTA.—Minneapolis single tax league. Every Thursday evening at the West hotel. Pres., C. J. Buell, 402 W. Franklin av.; sec., J. A. Sawyer, 304 Lumber exchange.

MISSOURI.—South Minneapolis single tax club. Wednesday evenings, at 1809 E. Lake st. Pres., A. M. Goodrich; sec., F. F. Hammarskjold.

ST. PAUL.—Pres., H. C. McCartney; sec., R. C. Morgan, Northern Pacific railroad office.

MISSOURI.—St. Louis single tax league, s. e. cor. 8th and Olive, meets every Tuesday evening. Rooms open every evening. Pres., Dr. Henry S. Chase; sec., Wm. C. Little.

LA DUE.—The Reform club of La Due. Pres., W. Stephens; sec., Jas. Wilson.

HERMAN.—Single tax committee. Pres., R. H. Hauseitner; sec., Dr. H. A. Hibbard.

HIGH GATE.—Single tax league. Meetings on alternate Thursdays at the house of W. M. Kinhead. Pres., Wm. Kinhead; sec., J. W. Swaw.

OAK HILL.—Single tax league. Pres., F. Debolt; sec., J. W. Miller.

NEBRASKA.—Omaha single tax club. Sunday afternoons, Gate City hall, cor. 13th and Douglas sts. Pres., Rufus S. Parker; sec., Cyrus F. Beckett, 411 N. 23d st.

WYMORE.—Henry George single tax club. Pres., H. C. Jaynes; sec., J. A. Hamm.

NEW JERSEY.—Standard single tax club. Business meetings every other Friday evening at the Avenue house, "Five Corners" Pres., E. N. Jackson, 23 Magnolia av.; sec., Joseph Dana Miller, 267 Grove st.

NEWARK.—Newark single tax club. Pres., Herbert Boggs, 52 Broad st.; sec., M. G. Gaffney 48 Warren place.

PATERSON.—Passaic Co. single tax club. Pres., E. W. Nellis; sec., John A. Craig, 192 Hamburg ave. Meetings every Monday evening at 109 Market street.

B. ORANGE.—Orange single tax club. Pres., E. H. Wallace; sec., Henry Haase.

VINELAND.—Vineland single tax and ballot reform club. Pres., Rev. Adolph Roeder; sec., Wm. P. Nichols, box 924.

JANVIER.—Janvier single tax and ballot reform club. Alternate Thursday evenings; Janvier hall. Pres., W. J. Rice; sec., Sydney R. Walsh.

CAMDEN.—Camden single tax club. Pres., Louis M. Randall; sec., Wm. M. Cullingham.

WASHINGTON.—Washington land and tax club. Pres., John Morrison; sec., W. H. Christine.

BAYONNE.—Single tax committee. Chairman, Wm. R. DuBois.

PASSAIC.—Single tax committee of Passaic. Pres., Oscar D. Wood.

NEW YORK.

NEW YORK.—Manhattan single tax club. Business meeting, first Thursday of each month, at 8 p.m.; other Thursdays, social and propaganda. Club rooms, 36 Clinton pl.; open every day from 6 p.m. to 12 p.m. Pres., Louis F. Post; sec., A. J. Steers.

Harlem single tax club. Room 3, 247 West 125th st. Business meeting every Tuesday, 8:30 p.m. Whist and social evening every Thursday. Pres., Eugene G. Muret; sec., Chas. H. Mitchell.

NEW YORK.—Reading single tax society. Monday evenings, 402½ Penn st. Pres., C. S. Prizer; sec., Grant

